

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Volume XLII

MAY 1945

Number 4

THE LAY OF THE BIG FOOL: ITS IRISH AND ARTHURIAN SOURCES

SHEILA JOYCE MCHUGH

THE "LAY OF THE BIG FOOL"

IN CONNECTION with various Arthurian problems, scholars have called attention to the folk tale of the Big Fool, which circulated in Ireland and the Scottish Highlands until the nineteenth century. It exists in two forms, as a lay—which is usually in verse, though sometimes in prose—and as a prose tale, which always includes the lay. Since the *Lay* occurs separately, the problem of its relationship to Irish and Arthurian tradition may profitably be treated without reference to the much more complicated problem of the *Tale*.¹ To date, scholarly activity on the subject has been inadequate: Alfred Nutt discerns a relation between the *Lay* and Arthurian fiction,² later recanting in favor of a purely Irish origin³ but conceding that an important version of the Big Fool must be translated before a definite conclusion can be reached.⁴ Without considering the question of the translation, William Henry Schofield points out a parallel with the

Arthurian "Fair unknown" romances.⁵ Dr. Hyde describes the untranslated text of the *Big Fool* as significant because of its connection with the Arthuriad, leaving for those interested in Arthurian studies the problem of solving the precise relationship involved.⁶

Inasmuch as the translation of the *Big Fool* under discussion has at last been made⁷ and evidence hitherto undiscovered is now available, it seems timely to reopen the question of the origin of the *Lay*. My intention is to prove that it is a complex of three themes—(1) the Irish story of Lomna the Coward and (2) the adventure with the hunter and his hound, of Welsh and Arthurian tradition, to which has been attached (3) a narrative convention and traditional material concerning Manannán. Before seeking to discover these three elements, it is desirable to furnish further information about the *Lay* itself.

A list of the several folk tales of the Big Fool gathered in the last century has been compiled for the purposes of this

¹ The structure of the Big Fool story I hope to make clear later—in a different connection—in a complete study of the English *Sir Percyvelle*. Considerable work has already been done on this subject (cf. S. McHugh, *The Irish connections of Sir Percyvelle* [Columbia University M.A. thesis, 1943]).

² *Studies on the legend of the Holy Grail* (London, 1888), pp. 152, 160 ff.

³ *Rev. Celt.*, XII (1891), 202-3.

⁴ *Folklore*, III (1892), 402.

⁵ "Studies on the Libeaus desconus," in [Harvard] *Studies and notes in philology and literature*, IV (Boston, 1895), 32-42, 171-74.

⁶ "Eachtra an Amadáin Móir," *Lia Fáil*, I (Dublin, 1927), 191, 193.

⁷ I am indebted for this translation to Seán Scallan, instructor in Gaelic at the Philo-Celtic Society of New York City.

study. The following are the versions that can be found in print:

1. "The Amadan Mor and the Gruagach of the Castle of Gold" is one of the prose stories in *Hero-tales of Ireland* (Boston, 1894), pp. 140-62, collected and edited by Jeremiah Curtin. Here the story and the lay form component parts of one continuous narrative.

2. "The adventures of the Amadan Mor" can be found in *Transactions of the Ossianic Society*, VI (Dublin, 1861), 161-207, edited by John O'Daly; the poems making up this volume have been taken from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century manuscript collections. This lay enjoys an existence distinct from that of the story of the Big Fool.

3. "The adventures of the Big Fool" ("Eachtra an Amadain Móir"), edited by Douglas Hyde in *Lia Fáil*, I (Dublin, 1927), 191-227, represents a combination of two manuscripts—H. 2. 6, in Trinity College, Dublin; and 24, p. 16, in the Royal Irish Academy—the former being written in 1716, the latter in 1730. This text forms the earliest extant version of the *Big Fool* and until the present time has never been translated into English.⁸ The story and lay are part of the same narrative but are separated from each other by extraneous material.

4. "The lay of the Great Fool" is contained in *Popular tales of the West Highlands*, III (Paisley, 1892), 160-91, orally collected and translated by John Francis Campbell. It was first written by Hector MacLean in 1860 from the recitation of Angus MacDonald of South Uist in the Hebrides. This poem contains fourteen verses taken down for Sir Kenneth MacKenzie from an oral rendering in 1850 at Gairloch and entitled "How the might of the Great Fool got the victory over the glamour of Manannán, and how he took his legs again from him by his might." This lay is preceded by a short prose tale of the Big Fool.

⁸ Using the two texts on which Hyde's version is based, L. Mühlhausen (*Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, XVII [1928], 15-26) made a German translation of the *Big Fool*; he stops at the point where the Big Fool slays the Purple Knight and wins the allegiance of Arthur and his followers. Since Mühlhausen leaves the *Lay* completely out of account, we can dismiss his translation as not within the scope of our interest.

5. "The Amadhan Mor" is among the prose tales in *Bardic stories of Ireland* (Dublin, 1875), pp. 151-55, collected and edited by Patrick Kennedy. The lay constitutes an independent unit.

6. A spurious version of the *Lay of the Big Fool* called "The lamentation of Umad for his hound" (*Laoidh 'n Amadain Mhoir 's a ghaothair bhain or Laoidh 'n Umaidh gan geille 'na sloigh*) is included in the poem "Manos" in *Galic antiquities* (Edinburgh, 1780), pp. 251 ff., composed by the Rev. John Smith. The poems comprising *Galic antiquities* were supposed to have been written by Ossian but are, in reality, forgeries by Smith, who published the "originals" in *Sean dana* (Edinburgh, 1787).⁹

7. In *Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, V (Halle, 1905), 558, Ludwig C. Stern furnishes a variant of the lay, "Duan an Amadain Mhor" (54 stanzas), which is common in Caithness in northwestern Scotland. It was written down in 1854 from the oral recitation of Christina Sutherland, who was born in 1775.

8. A version of the lay, "Laoidh an Amadain Mhoir" (51 stanzas), is available in *Reliquiae Celticae*, I (Inverness, 1892), 280-94, by Alexander Cameron; it was taken from the MacFarlane collection, one of the most accurate collections ever sent to the Highland Society of Scotland.

9. The longest metrical version of the *Lay of the Big Fool*—except for the O'Daly variant cited above, which is also 158 stanzas in length—is *Eachtra an Amadain Mhoir* (Dublin, 1911), edited by John J. O'Kelly. Like O'Daly, O'Kelly transcribed from manuscript copies.

10. John F. Campbell in *Leabhar na Féinne*, I (London, 1872), 203-8, supplies four editions of the lay:

a) *Rann na Duan Mu'n Amadan Mhor, agus Mu Ghruagach Dhun-an-Oir*, taken from Fletcher's Collection. This collection was orally made in 1750 between Scone and Dunstaffnage, the chief seats of the Scoto-Irish kings.

⁹ Cf. L. C. Stern, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Literaturgesch.*, N.F. Vol. VIII (1895); cf. also E. D. Snyder, *The Celtic revival* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 123 f.; Alex. Macbain, *Celtic magazine*, XII, 249 ff.

- b) *Laoidh on Amadain Mhoir* (37 stanzas).
 c) *Laoidh an Amadain Mhoir* (24 stanzas).
 The poems of both b and c were taken from Dr. Irvine's Collection. This collection was orally made from the recitations of farmers, farm-servants, etc., by Dr. Irvine of Little Dunkeld in 1801.
 d) *Laoidh an Umpi* (also called *Dan comhainm Laoidh an Amadain Mhoir*). This poem which is written as a song was taken down in 1801 by MacDonald of Staffa from the oral utterance of Donald MacLean, who was born in 1715 and who learned it from Calum MacPhail, his grandfather.¹⁰

The summary of the *Lay of the Big Fool* which follows is constructed with Hyde's version as basis. Although the most representative, this variant of the lay lacks some features which are essential to our purpose; these appear in some, or all, of the remaining versions and have been inserted here in italics.

The Big Fool, having subdued all the kingdoms of the world by his physical prowess, meets in Lochlann the daughter of the King of Asia, a maid of extraordinary beauty, who becomes his wife and constant companion. One day, as they are walking in a mysterious and sequestered glen, they are accosted by a warrior wearing choice arms and clothes, who is carrying a bright silver dish containing boar's meat, wheat kneaded in honey, and a golden goblet full of honey and sweet wine. Saying that it is fitting for a warrior to offer food and drink to his lord, the stranger extends an invitation to the Fool to partake of their contents. The maiden warns him not to do so, declaring that powerful people dwell there who put a spell in food and drink. The champion departs, leaving the food, and the damsel and

the Fool do not know what road he takes. Meanwhile, the Fool, *having been seized by an insatiable hunger and thirst*, drinks heartily from the goblet and consumes some of the food. As a result, his legs drop off at the knees, and he realizes that he has been bewitched. The girl chides him for his misfortune because she knows that now he will be unable to provide food and clothing for them, much less acquire riches. The following day, the Big Fool is carried by his companion from their castle to a near-by hillock and, hearing the musical bark of a hound, casts his spear at the approaching deer, kills it, and captures the *red-eared* white hound following on its track. *The Big Fool asserts that he will keep this hound for amusement until pursuers come.* A huge knight, *the first of the hunters*—dressed in a highly ornamented shirt and speckled hauberk, with sweet-noted horn around his neck and gold inlaid sword at his side—comes up in search of his hound. The legless Fool, realizing what a convenience the hound would be to him, is reluctant to relinquish it. *A dispute, both verbal and physical in nature, arises between the owner of the hound and the Big Fool as to its custody.* But when the knight, a *gruagach* (enchanter), promises the couple food, drink, and clothing for life, the Fool quickly changes his mind and readily gives up the hound. *It is finally given into the girl's charge, at her request.* The three depart for the *gruagach's* abode, *Dún an Oir* (the *Fort of Gold*), where the strangers are introduced to the enchanter's wife. The enchanter discloses that the young man is the son of the brother of the King of the World and is called the Big Fool of the Forest and the damsel is the daughter of the King of Asia. *She is puzzled to hear that the Big Fool, who has the whole world at his beck and call, is yet without legs, but is soon informed that the sorcery of the magic cup has caused his plight.* On the morrow, the *gruagach* sets out for the forest to hunt, leaving the Big Fool to guard his queen. The enchanter's wife rejoices that the Fool has come and promises him the choicest food, drink, and clothing—befitting the King of the World himself (i.e., King Arthur)—provided he will not disclose her secret to anyone, especially not to her husband; the Big Fool gives his word that

¹⁰ For unprinted versions of the *Big Fool*, cf. T. K. Abbott and E. J. Gwynn, *Catalogue of the Irish MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin, 1921), pp. 216, 219, 221, 225, 279, 284, 286, 299; S. H. O'Grady, *Catalogue of Irish MSS. in the British Museum, I* (London, 1909), 564, 598, 627, 631; R. Flower, *Catalogue of Irish MSS. in the British Museum, II* (London, 1926), 376; D. Mackinnon, *A descriptive catalogue of Gaelic MSS. in the Advocates' Library and elsewhere in Scotland*, pp. 278-79, 293.

he will not betray her confidence. A little later, a warrior enters, and the queen and he have a tryst, the Fool, in the meantime, having fallen into a mysterious sleep. Awakened by his wife, the Big Fool has her carry him to the door of the room in which the couple have been making love; holding his sword in hand, he prevents the stranger from escaping. Even though the warrior restores his legs and promises him, among other things, vast treasure, and his charger, as fleet on sea as on land, the Fool refuses to release him and thus prove false to the *gruagach's* trust. Thereupon, the stranger takes off his disguise and turns out to be the *gruagach* of the Fort; he acknowledges that he is, to boot, the possessor of the hound, the server of the enchanted draught, and the long-lost brother of the Fool. The enchanter is highly pleased at the Fool's loyalty. The two set out for the forest, where dwell giants who have been for a long time harassing the country; and the Big Fool soon disposes of them. The Fool and the enchanter resolve to live together forever in peace and amity.

The *Lay* in its most complete form, when broken up into its constituent parts, may be summarized as follows: (1) The Big Fool, accompanied by a beautiful maid, is on a walking tour in a wooded and mysterious glen. (2) The couple encounters a magnificently appareled stranger, who induces the Fool to partake of the contents of a costly dish and goblet, with the result that his legs fall off. The Fool consents only because he has suddenly been seized with a quenchless thirst. (3) A hunt is in progress in the valley, and the Big Fool shoots the deer that happens to pass their way and captures the pursuing hound; this hound is white with red ears. (4) The hunter approaches and demands his hound, a quarrel ensuing over its custody. (5) The hero relinquishes the hound only because he has been promised food, drink, and clothing for life at the stranger's castle—a reward essential to one in his legless state. (6) The hound is put into the charge of the Fool's companion. (7) The huntsman, an en-

chanter, conducts the pair to his *dún*, called the Fort of Gold. (8) There they meet a maid of singular beauty, wife of the enchanter, who helps to entertain the newcomers. (9) Next morning the enchanter goes forth to hunt; he leaves his wife under the protection of the Big Fool, in case anyone should enter the *dún* to pay false compliments to her. (10) The Fool is overcome by a sudden drowsiness, falls asleep, and permits an intruder to enter and make love to his host's wife. (11) The Fool's wife hurriedly awakes him, and he refuses to let the stranger depart, although he is offered priceless gifts and his legs have been restored. (12) The enchanter, returning, throws off his disguise, and reveals his identity, confessing that he is also the donor of the bespelled drink and the owner of the hound. The enchanter rejoices in the sincerity of the Fool's friendship. (13) The Big Fool makes short work of giants who have been doing great harm to the enchanter's country. (14) The Fool and his companion live in happiness at the *dún* of the enchanter from then on.

There can be no question that the *Lay of the Big Fool* is a product of tradition; moreover, in essence an *omnium gatherum*, it is itself a combination of diverse traditions. In what follows, we shall analyze these different layers of tradition, leaving the question of how they finally became welded until the end.

THE IRISH SOURCE FOR THE *amour* IN THE "LAY"

It is a relatively simple matter to establish an Irish origin for certain features in the *Lay of the Big Fool*.

The story, *The death of Lomna*,¹¹ is preserved under "Orc tréith" in Cormac's *Glossary*, a late ninth- or early tenth-

¹¹ The Lomna story has been treated by R. D. Scott, *The thumb of knowledge* (New York, 1930), pp. 3 f.; and by G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt* (New York, 1913), II, 311.

century work¹² ascribed to Cormac, scholar-king of Cashel. In the *Glossary* there are two allusions to Finn—that about Finn and the jester, Lomna, belonging to the ninth century.¹³ This composition about the unfaithfulness of Finn's wife is one of the most ancient legends extant concerning Finn; it is localized in the neighborhood of Tipperary.

Finn, grandson of Baiscne, has as his fool Lomna the Coward. One day Finn went on a hunting excursion. Lomna remained at home. Finn had a wife of the Luigni, for on every mountain and in every forest that Finn and his Fiann used to frequent, there was a certain woman awaiting him from the neighboring country. These were female landholders, and they were good to support the Fiann, for their wealth spread over the territories, so that no one durst do evil to them. Once, then it happened that Finn was in Teffia with his Fiann, and he went on a hunting excursion. Lomna stayed at home. While he was walking outside he found Coirpre, a champion of the Luigni, lying secretly with Finn's wife. Then the woman entreated Lomna to conceal it, but indeed it was grievous to him to betray Finn. . . .¹⁴

It is easy to make graphic in parallel columns the agreement between *The death of Lomna* and the corresponding incident in the *Big Fool*:

The death of Lomna

1. Finn goes on a hunting expedition.
2. Finn has his fool, Lomna the Coward, remain at home.
3. The fool discovers Coirpre, a champion of the Luigni, having a clandestine assignation with Finn's wife.
4. Finn's wife beseeches Lomna to conceal her intrigue; the fool is averse to betraying his master.

¹² On this date cf. E. O'Curry, *Lectures on the manuscript materials of ancient Irish history* (Dublin, 1878), p. 17; K. Meyer, *Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, VIII, 178; R. Thurneysen, *Die irische Helgen- und Königsage* (Halle, 1921), pp. 19 f.

¹³ Cf. K. Meyer, *Royal Irish Academy* ("Todd lecture series," Vol. XVI [Dublin, 1910]), pp. xix f.

¹⁴ This translation has been quoted verbatim from W. Stokes, *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1891-94, p. 177.

On the basis of this comparison, it is safe to say that important elements in the *Lay of the Big Fool* are derived from a story known in Ireland in the ninth or tenth century, at the latest.

THE WELSH AND ARTHURIAN CONNECTIONS OF THE "LAY"

We have seen how Ireland played her natural role in contributing to the formation of a native folk tale. Now the question arises as to whether the *Lay* in part proceeds from traditions not indigenous to Ireland. This entails an analysis of an adventure in the Welsh *Pwyll Prince of Dyved* and in *Le Bel Inconnu* and *Lîbeaus desconus*, the French and English representatives, respectively, of the "Fair unknown" romances. Brief descriptions and abstracts of these stories follow.

1. *Pwyll Prince of Dyved* constitutes the first of the Four branches of the *Mabinogi*, belonging, therefore, to the very oldest stratum of Welsh fiction. Although the exact dating of the *Mabinogion* is still a matter of dispute,¹⁵ it is probable that this part of it was first committed to writing—a previous oral career can be presupposed—about the middle of the eleventh century. It is a product of western Wales.

Lay of the Big Fool

1. The *gruagach* goes on a hunting excursion.
2. The *gruagach* has the Big Fool remain behind to guard his wife.
3. The Big Fool discovers that a champion has secretly entered the *gruagach's* castle and is having a love-tryst with his wife.
4. The *gruagach's* wife entreats the Big Fool not to betray her secret love affair to anyone, especially not to the *gruagach*; the Fool, reluctant, promises only because she, of herself, has given him her confidence.

¹⁵ On the varying opinions for this date cf. *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*, ed. I. Williams (Cardiff, 1930), pp. xxxvi-xli; *Les Mabinogion*, ed. J. Loth (Paris, 1913), I, 12 f.; W. J. Gruffydd, *Trans. Hon. Soc. of Cymmrodorion*, 1912-13, p. 64.

2. The French romance of *Le Bel Inconnu* was written in the closing years of the twelfth century; the poet in concluding gives his name as Renaud de Beaujeu.

3. *Libeaus desconus*, composed in the dialect of the south of England—that of Kent or some neighboring district—was written about the middle of the fourteenth century. This English poem is anonymous.

1. Setting out from his palace, Pwyll, Prince of Dyved, lets loose his dogs in the wood, sounds the horn, and begins the chase. In the distance he hears the cry of other hounds, a cry different from that of his own and coming from the opposite direction. As he enters a glade, he spies a stag pursued by hounds of exceptional beauty, their hair being a brilliant, shining white and their ears a glistening red. Although these are about to kill the stag, he drives them off and sets his own dogs upon it. Mounted on a large gray steed, a huntsman, clad in garments of gray woolen, soon approaches. He refuses to greet Pwyll because of his discourtesy to the hounds. Pwyll begs to atone for his misdemeanor according to the dignity of the stranger. He is Arawn, a king of Annwn, and his friendship can be regained only if Pwyll, in the form of Arawn, will a year from that day rid him of Havgan, a rival king of Annwn. Arawn promises to take charge of Pwyll's kingdom in his stead in return for a similar promise made on Pwyll's part. Through Arawn's power, Pwyll assumes Arawn's semblance and Arawn his, Arawn conducting him until he comes in sight of the palace of Annwn. Here Pwyll is divested of his hunting-garb, clothed in vesture of silk and gold, and seated at a banquet table with Arawn's fair and charming queen. He spends the year in various diversions, and, although sharing the same chamber with his host's wife, always respects the fact that she belongs to another. At the appointed time, he fells Havgan with a deadly blow and goes to keep his tryst with Arawn. Arawn rejoices at Pwyll's victory over his rival and congratulates him on his loyalty to him. From this time forward, Pwyll becomes known as Pwyll, Chief of Annwn, as well as Pwyll, prince of Dyved.¹⁵

¹⁵ Loth. I, 81-90.

2. On their way from Arthur's court to bring aid to the daughter of King Gringars, Le Bel Inconnu, with his companions, beauteous Hélié, his squire Robert, and a dwarf, are riding along by a forest. They see a frightened stag with sixteen antlers hurry by them; after it rush leaping hounds of different colors, followed by one apart from the rest. This one, having a thorn in its foot, stops *en mi la voie* near Hélié. She, seeing its beauty, alights, seizes the dog, and mounts again, declaring that she will carry it off to her lady. It is a rather small white dog with black ears and a black spot on its right flank; none of the group has ever seen a dog more beautiful. Mounted on a hunting horse, the owner, a hunter, holding a horn and carrying a lance in his hand, hurriedly approaches, followed by his dogs. He is dressed in a short coat of woolen material and his person is both pleasing and handsome. A chevalier of high rank, he has a castle built there for the sake of convenience while hunting. Seeing Hélié putting the dog under her mantle, he begs her to let it be free to go after the other dogs. She is obstinate, and he appeals to Le Bel Inconnu, who vainly tries to induce her to relinquish it. The owner goes away muttering vengeful threats. Returning from his castle, he draws near again, now fully armed, and in a loud voice demands his dog. A fight ensues and he is worsted by Le Bel Inconnu, who makes him vow to go to the court of King Arthur. He already knows Le Bel Inconnu's name; he is himself the Proud Knight of the Glade, he informs his vanquisher. They take leave of each other. Hélié keeps the dog.¹⁷

3. On their way from Arthur's court to Sinadoun to rescue its queen, Sir Libeaus and the lovely Elene enter another country, and riding on a hill, hear a blowing of horns below the down and the sound of a great hunt and of many hounds running in the vale. The dwarf who is acting as their guide recognizes the horn as that of Sir Otes de Lisle. As they ride talking, a dog comes running across their way, and they all agree that he is the fairest that they have ever seen; he is of all colors—like early summer flowers. Elene, considering him more precious than any jewel, covets him;

¹⁷ Renaud de Beaujeu, *Le Bel Inconnu*, ed. G. P. Williams (Paris, 1929), vss. 1260-1482.

straightway, Libeaus catches the *brachet* for her and they ride on together, speaking of knightly deeds done for the sake of *ladies brist and schene*. Having ridden scarcely a mile in the forest, they see a hind come flying by, followed by two greyhounds. Libeaus and the maiden draw bridle under a linden to watch the course of the hind. Soon they see approach on a bay charger a knight clothed in silk of dark blue (*inde*); this knight courteously asks for the return of the dog, explaining that he has owned it for the last seven years. Libeaus refuses to comply, and when Sir Otes de Lisle at last becomes angry, he makes light of the threats of a mere churl. The stranger immediately declares that his father was an earl and his mother the Countess of Carlisle. In haste, the lord rides to his tower, informing his followers that one of King Arthur's knights has stolen his dog. They all don armor and pursue Libeaus, who has his companions withdraw to safety in the woods. A terrible fight takes place, but Libeaus succeeds in putting to flight those whom he does not slay; Sir Otes de Lisle finally yields to him, promising him his treasure, his lands, and his castle, and agreeing to present himself as a prisoner at Arthur's court. The lord conducts Libeaus to his castle, fifteen knights accompanying Elene. There she tells of Libeaus' brave deeds, and the lord rejoices in such a knight. Libeaus remains a fortnight to let his wounds heal; the lord proceeds at once for Arthur's court.¹⁸

By placing the parallel incidents in the Welsh and Arthurian material side by side with those in the Irish lay, their relationship can be more easily detected.

1. It is obvious that the stories summarized in the table on pages 204-5 follow a generally consistent pattern.

2. This pronounced similarity, despite the passage of time and the difference in place of origin, appears to be the result of a widely spread tradition. Because *Pwyll* antedates the "Fair unknown" romances and the *Lay of the Big Fool*, it seems only logical to conclude that it is

the source of this tradition. However, since "the traditions of Wales as they have reached us in the *Four branches* are only a fragment of the whole and retain little of their original form,"¹⁹ it is probable that a story analogous to, but not identical with, *Pwyll* is the original of the incident in question.

3. The *Lay of the Big Fool* embodies traits common to *Le Bel Inconnu* tradition but absent from *Pwyll* (Nos. 2, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 24, in the table of parallels) and ingredients found in *Pwyll* but missing from *Le Bel Inconnu* tradition (Nos. 8, 25, 26, 27); *Pwyll* and *Le Bel Inconnu* tradition have features in common which are lacking in the *Big Fool* (Nos. 7, 12, 13, 19). It seems likely, therefore, that there once existed some variant form of this tale which is no longer extant.

It will now be necessary to consider carefully whether the episode as exemplified in the *Lay of the Big Fool* stems directly from the Welsh tradition or whether it came in through some intermediate French Arthurian romance.

THE CASE FOR THE ARTHURIAN ORIGIN OF THE HOUND SITUATION

Before attempting to formulate a definite theory concerning the interrelationship of the *Lay of the Big Fool* and Arthurian tradition, in the form of a romance similar to *Le Bel Inconnu* and *Libeaus desconnus*, it is essential to make at least a slight survey of the extent to which general Arthurian tradition prevailed in Ireland. If it can be shown that such a tradition was extensive or, indeed, existed at all, its embodiment in the *Big Fool* cannot be regarded as unusual. The truth of the matter is that a knowledge of the Arthurian cycle was quite widespread in Ireland. Its influence can be seen in (1) the translation of parts, at

¹⁸ *Libeaus desconnus*, ed. M. Kaluza ("Altenglische Bibliothek," Vol. V [Leipzig, 1890]), vms. 1057-1290.

¹⁹ R. S. Loomis, *MLR*, XXIV (1929), 47.

<i>Mabinogi of Pwyll</i>	<i>Libeaus desconus</i>	<i>Le Bel Inconnu</i>	<i>The Big Fool</i>
1. Pwyll is hunting in the woods	Libeaus is riding on a hill in the woods	Le Bel Inconnu is riding along by a forest	The Big Fool is on a hillock (Hyde); is walking in a sequestered glen (the other versions)
2.	He is accompanied by a beauteous maid	He is accompanied by a beauteous maid	He is accompanied by a beauteous maid (all)
3. He has set out from his palace	They have set out from King Arthur's court	They have set out from King Arthur's court	They have set out from a castle (Curtin, O'Daly, Hyde)
4. He enters a glade in the wood	They enter another country	They enter the lands of the Proud Knight of the Glade	They enter an unknown valley (all)
5. He hears the cry of hounds	They hear the sound of hound and horn		They hear the sound of hound and horn (Campbell); they hear the bark of a hound (Hyde)
6. A stag appears pursued by these hounds	A hind appears pursued by two greyhounds and preceded by a <i>rach</i>	A stag appears pursued by hounds with one apart from the rest	A stag appears pursued by hounds and mounted men (Kennedy); a deer appears pursued by a hound (the other versions)
7. Pwyll is struck by the comeliness of the hounds	They are impressed by the beauty of the <i>rach</i>	They are impressed by the beauty of the dog	
8. They are white and red-eared	He is of all colors	He is white and black-eared with a black spot on one flank	He is white (all) and red-eared (Campbell, O'Daly)
9. Pwyll drives these dogs away and lets his own kill the deer (?)	Libeaus' companion admires and covets the dog, and he catches it for her	Le Bel Inconnu's companion alights and seizes the dog	Having killed the deer, the Big Fool captures the hound (all) and later gives it to his companion, at her request (O'Daly)
10.	She intends to keep it for amusement	She intends it for her lady's amusement	The Big Fool intends to keep it for amusement (Campbell, O'Daly)
11. The owner of the hounds approaches	The owner of the dog approaches	The owner of the dog approaches	The owner of the hound approaches (all)
12. He rides a large light-gray steed	He rides a bay steed	He is mounted on horseback	
13. He is clad in garments of gray woolen		He is dressed in a short coat of heavy woolen	
14. He is a hunter	He is a hunter	He is a hunter	He is dressed as a hunter (Hyde); he is a hunter (the other versions)
15. He is Arawn, a king of Annwn	He is the son of an earl and a countess	He is a chevalier of high rank	He is the enchanter of a many-colored castle (Hyde); of the Fort of Gold (the other versions)

<i>Mabinogi of Pwyll</i>	<i>Libeaus desconus</i>	<i>Le Bel Inconnu</i>	<i>The Big Fool</i>
16.	He requests the return of his dog	He requests the return of his dog	He requests the return of his hound (all)
17.	They refuse to part with the dog	They refuse to part with the dog	The Big Fool refuses to part with the hound (all)
18. The owner scolds Pwyll for his treatment of his hounds	Libeaus and the owner argue over its custody	Le Bel Inconnu and the owner argue over its custody	They argue over its custody (all)
19. The owner threatens Pwyll	The owner threatens Libeaus	The owner threatens Le Bel Inconnu	
20.	They engage in combat	They engage in combat	The Big Fool challenges the owner to fight (Curtin, O'Daly); they engage in combat (Campbell)
21. Pwyll voluntarily offers restitution	The owner is forced to make restitution	The owner is forced to make restitution	The owner is forced to make restitution (Campbell, O'Daly); the owner voluntarily offers restitution (the other versions)
22. The quarrel ends in friendly understanding	The quarrel ends in friendly understanding	The quarrel ends in friendly understanding	The quarrel ends in friendly understanding (all)
23. Arawn conducts Pwyll to the court of Annwn	The lord, attended by knights, conducts Libeaus and his companion to his castle		The enchanter conducts the Big Fool and his companion to his castle (all)
24.	Libeaus' companion tells of his prowess and the lord revels in it		The Big Fool's companion tells of his prowess, and the enchanter revels in it (Kennedy, Curtin, Campbell); the enchanter boasts of the Big Fool's prowess (O'Daly)
25. Pwyll is welcomed and entertained by Arawn's wife			The Big Fool is greeted and entertained by the enchanter's wife (all)
26. Pwyll is left in the palace with Arawn's wife			The Big Fool is left in the castle with the enchanter's wife (all)
27. The host is pleased with the hero's loyalty and renews their friendship			The host is pleased with the hero's loyalty and renews their friendship (all)

least, of Arthurian romances into Irish, (2) the employment of Arthurian motifs in Irish literature, and (3) the use of Arthurian names for characters in Gaelic folk tales. Translations of Grail romances were produced in Ireland. It is to be regretted that the translated texts exist in

a fragmentary state and that some still remain unedited. Fortunately, a few specimens of Irish Grail versions—probably dating from the fifteenth century—have been printed.²⁰ Besides known frag-

²⁰ M. Nettlau, *Rev. celt.*, X (1889), 178-91; F. N. Robinson, *Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, IV (1903), 381-93.

ments connected with the Grail, George Henderson observes that Arthurian motifs may be traced in the following modern Irish folk tales: *Am Brôn Binn* ("The melodious sorrow"), *Am Brat* ("The cloak"), and *Eachtra an Amadain Mhoir* ("Tale of the Great Fool"), the first of which he analyzes in detail.²¹ Arthurian names appear in *Eachtra an Mhadhra Mhaoil* ("The adventures of the crop-eared dog") and *Eachtra Mhacacaimh an Iolair* ("The adventures of eagle boy").²² To be specific, Arthur plays a part in both. In the former, mention is made of an *Buird Cruinn* ("the Round Table"), and five Arthurian knights appear: Gawain (Bhalbhuaidh), Lancelot (Lámhsholas), Galahad (Galfas), Lionel (Libnil), and Bors (Bobus).²³ In the latter, Sir Gawain makes an appearance and much of the action takes place in an *Phoraois Bhao-ghalach* ("the Forest Peryllous").²⁴ To corroborate French, if not Arthurian, influence further, it has been shown that *Eachtra Mhacacaimh an Iolair* is in essence but a "contamination" of two medieval French romances, *Alysaunder le orphelin*, which Malory (*Morte D'Arthur*, Book X, chaps. xxxii–xl) interpolates in the Tristan legend, and *Sir Eglamour of Artois*.²⁵ There can be no dispute that such evidence shows the infiltration of French Arthurian romance into Ireland.

The fact that there was an Irish Arthurian tradition makes the acquaintance of the Gaelic story-teller with the Arthurian adventure, "The dispute over the

hound," more than a mere possibility. Besides, this theme is a constantly recurring one in Arthurian fiction and is by no means confined to the "Fair unknown" romances which we have examined. Its distinctive features are evident in *Peredur*, *Le Conte du Graal*, *Wigalois*, and other romances. This casts a favorable light on the chance of its reaching Ireland.

More concretely, the facts themselves establish a direct relationship between the *Big Fool* and Arthurian story: the *Lay* embodies features common to *Le Bel Inconnu* tradition but completely missing from the Welsh *Pwyll* (Nos. 2, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 24). It is important to see in what way the Arthurian and Irish treatments of the theme coincide. The Arthurian conception, in effect, revolves around the dispute over a captured dog. On this point, the Arthurian and Irish versions are in perfect agreement. Although there is a dispute about hounds in the Welsh, the capture of one of them finds no place. The motive for the capture is there, however—the comeliness of the hounds and the admiration which it evokes in the hero. Let us occupy ourselves for a moment with the Arthurianization of this detail as it stands in *Le Bel Inconnu* and *Libeaus desconus*. Here we have an example of what Loomis so aptly describes as "the constant effort . . . of the French to bring order and reason and chivalric manners into a beautiful but bewildering mass of story."²⁶ If the germ of the idea already existed in the Welsh story, it has been elaborated by the medieval romancer in a distinctly chivalric way. For example, on seeing the extraordinary beauty of the dog, Elene, in the English poem, covets it, and Libeaus, in true knightly fashion, grants her her heart's desire. Hélie, in the French romance, alights and seizes the dog, declaring—again, ac-

²¹ *Miscellany presented to Kuno Meyer* (Halle, 1912), pp. 18–33.

²² R. A. S. Macalister ("Irish Texts Society," Vol. X [London, 1908]).

²³ T. O'Rathaille, *Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge*, XIX (Dublin, August, 1909), 356, 357, n.5. O'Rathaille suggests that Lámhsholas should more properly be represented by Lámhsalot, Galfas by Galafas, Libnil by Libhinel, and Bobus by Boos (Bobhos).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 356.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

²⁶ *MP*, XXXIII, 238.

cording to courtly etiquette—that she will present it as a gift to her lady. It is the possession of this dog by the hero's companion that brings on the dispute with the knightly owner. The Arthurian setting is obvious. The Welsh handling is much more primitive: Pwyll rudely drives away the comely hounds and sets his own on the stag, thus antagonizing the owner. In the Irish redactions, in accord with the Arthurian formula, the hero, in every case, captures the hound—twice, for the sake of amusement (Campbell,²⁷ O'Daly²⁸) and, once, later gives it to his companion at her request (O'Daly²⁹). In the Kennedy variant, the capture is unnecessary, for the dog, leaping with joy, comes up to the hero, licking his hands.³⁰ There can be no reasonable doubt that it is the Arthurian tradition rather than the *mabinogi* which is echoed in the Irish.

The assumption of an immediate Arthurian original for part of the plot of the *Lay* seems justified on another score—the presence of the girl-companion. This character is absent altogether from the Welsh. A brief review of the Arthurian aspect of such a figure is in order. It is a commonplace of Arthurian romance for a maid to accompany the hero on an adventure or conduct him to one. The accompanying damsel is usually devoid of personality; the conductress is often a damsel *maldisante*, who is characterized by a sharp tongue. The following are among the Arthurian romances in which the latter appears: *Le Bel Inconnu* (Hélie), *Libeaus desconus* (Elene), *La Cote male taile* of Malory and the prose *Tristan* (Beauvivant), and Malory's "Book of Gareth" (Linot). The character in question can be

described as follows: (1) She is the companion of a young and inexperienced hero on his first, or one of his more important, adventures. (2) She is a scold, who constantly upbraids the hero, often presumably without just cause. (3) She has, in reality, the hero's welfare at heart and actually deserves the epithet *bienpensante*, which Launcelot gives her in *La Cote male taile*. (4) She finally apologizes for her *vilonie*. (5) She often becomes the hero's wife. The maiden who accompanies the Big Fool on his adventure is essentially a damsel *maldisante*; it is important to remember that her prototype is to be found in Hélie and Elene, typical damsels *maldisantes*. She fulfils the function of this conventional figure in the following ways: (1) She is, more or less, a conducting damsel; she warns the hero that they are in mysterious surroundings and that he must not accept the draught offered by the enchanter;³¹ (2) she cautions him that the drowsiness about to overcome him in the strange glen is not due to mere sleepiness.³² (3) She taunts the hero on the loss of his legs and laments bitterly that it is her lot that such as he should be her husband;³³ she chides him for falling asleep and permitting an intruder to enter and pay court to his benefactor's wife.³⁴ (4) She has the hero's welfare really at heart and proudly boasts of his prowess to the enchanter's wife,³⁵ as Elene sings the praises of her knight under much the same circumstances. (5) The hero himself admits to his companion that had he obeyed her orders he would not now be legless.³⁶ (6) She is the hero's wife.³⁷ Al-

²⁷ All versions of the *Lay*.

²⁸ J. Curtin, *Hero-tales of Ireland* (Boston, 1894), p. 154.

²⁹ *Ibid.*; Hyde, p. 224.

³⁰ Curtin, p. 159; Campbell, III, 182; O'Daly, VI, 179.

³¹ Campbell, p. 180; Curtin, p. 158.

³² Curtin, p. 155.

³³ All versions of the *Lay*.

²⁷ *Popular tales of the West Highlands* (2d ed.; London: Falsley, 1892), III, 174.

²⁸ *Trans. Ossian. Soc.* (Dublin, 1861), VI, 169.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

³⁰ *Bardic stories of Ireland* (Dublin, 1875), p. 152.

though the fundamental character of the damsel *maldisante* is rather faithfully reproduced in the *Big Fool*, the following departures from the conventional type should be noted: (1) The hero's companion does not set out as his guide on a previously specified mission. (2) She is his wife to begin with, and the hero does not win her hand as a result of his exploits on this mission. (3) She never has cause to explain her conduct, which is always justified. (4) In two instances, she begs the hero as a last resort to yield to the intruder³⁸—an act of cowardice which would never be countenanced by a true damsel *maldisante*.

If the *Lay* shows signs of being in part a direct Arthurian derivative, the following allusions to Arthurian tradition accentuate this: the enchanter identifies himself as "the Knight of the Mantle" (O'Daly),³⁹ as *Ridire Corcair*, i.e., the "Purple Knight" (Campbell);⁴⁰ the enchanter maintains that he has received the Fool's legs from "the Knight of the Cross" (Curtin);⁴¹ reference is made to the King of the World, i.e., King Arthur (Hyde).⁴² That we are dealing here with the Irish modifications of an Arthurian theme there can be little doubt.

THE CASE AGAINST THE WELSH ORIGIN OF THE HOUND SITUATION

Those parallels (Nos. 8, 25, 26, 27) which show what appears to be a direct borrowing of the Irish *Lay* from *Pwyll* deserve consideration at this point. Let us examine each of the features in some detail: (1) Number 8 suggests that the red-eared white hound is a distinctly Welsh conception, which could very well be the

source for its counterpart in the *Big Fool*. But this hound belongs to Irish, Scottish, and Continental Arthurian, as well as Welsh, tradition: it turns up—to illustrate—in the Irish *Lay of Oisín on the land of youth*,⁴³ in the Highland *Knight of the glens and bens and passes*,⁴⁴ and in the Arthurian *Wigalois*, where the hound has one red ear.⁴⁵ The evidence of this German romance shows that the coloring of the hound in the *Lay* may have been derived not directly from the Welsh but through a French intermediary. (2) Numbers 25, 26, and 27 can be taken as a unit: they have to do with the hero's conduct toward the lady of the castle in his host's absence. This part of the story does not appear in *Le Bel Inconnu* and *Libeaus desconus*, but its presence in *Pwyll* and the *Big Fool* proves that it belonged to the original pattern of the tale. Moreover, these elements have been perpetuated in Arthurian legend in the hunting and temptation scenes of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and its analogues. The hound adventure in the "Fair unknown" romances obviously constitutes only a truncated form of the fundamental design, the story in its entirety being no longer fully represented by any one Arthurian version extant. The omission of these elements from *Le Bel Inconnu* and *Libeaus desconus* does not necessarily mean, then, that the *Lay* drew directly on Welsh material. It could equally well have borrowed from an Arthurian source no longer available.

On the whole, the case for an immediate Welsh source for the hound situation in the *Big Fool* is not especially strong. There may have been an old Welsh form

³⁸ Kennedy, p. 155; O'Daly, p. 191.

³⁹ P. 171.

⁴⁰ P. 159.

⁴¹ P. 176.

⁴² P. 194 and *passim*.

⁴³ *Trans. Ossian. Soc.*, IV (Dublin, 1859), 249.

⁴⁴ J. MacDougall, *Folktales and fairy lore* (Edinburgh, 1910), pp. 2, 5.

⁴⁵ Cf. Schofield, p. 33.

of the story, now inaccessible to us, which would cast a different light on the matter. But this seems unlikely, in view of the evidence in favor of an Arthurian origin.

MANANNÁN AND THE "LAY OF THE BIG FOOL"

There is one striking feature of the *Lay* that is thus far unexplained: at the end of the episode we are told that it is the same personage who has played the roles of the donor of the enchanted drink and the owner of the hound who left his wife in the keeping of the Fool and the clandestine lover. This reappearance of a shape-shifter in various guises in the same story is certainly a Celtic motif.⁴⁶ In the Welsh *mabinogi* of *Manawyddan*, the enchanter Llywd takes in succession the forms of a clerk, a priest, and a bishop. In *Peredur* a youth declares that it was he who appeared as a maiden in six different scenes. Hyde, speaking of the modern Irish folk tale, *The lad of the ferule*, asserts:

The reader familiar with Irish story-telling will understand that all this machinery of the hounds, the hunting . . . was put in motion by a mysterious being, a god in fact (a similar being appears in some stories as Lugh, and in others as Manannán), to the end that he might save *Tír na n-Óg*.⁴⁷

Now Campbell explains that part of the *Lay of the Big Fool* has been known as "How the might of the Great Fool got the victory over the glamour of Manannán, and how he took his legs again from him by his might."⁴⁸ This title reveals that in the mind of some Irish or Hebridean story-teller the enchanter was

identified with the sea-god Manannán. It is more than possible that this identification was implicit in the earliest form of the *Lay*. For from early times Manannán was renowned as a shape-shifter. In *The wooing of Luaine and the death of Athirne*⁴⁹ (fourteenth century),⁵⁰ it is asserted categorically that the heathen Irish and Britons worshipped Manannán as a god, because he metamorphosed himself into many shapes. In *The Kern in the narrow stripes*⁵¹ (sixteenth century),⁵² Manannán appears as a harpist, a medical student, a warrior, and a conjurer; moreover, as in the *Lay*, his identity is not disclosed until the end.

There are other suggestions that the shape-shifter of the *Lay* was Manannán. In *The fate of the children of Tuireann*, Manannán possesses a steed that travels with equal ease on sea and land.⁵³ So, too, according to Campbell, does the enchanter of the *Lay*.⁵⁴ In *The adventures of Cormac in the Land of Promise* the king is enveloped in mist before he reaches Manannán's palace,⁵⁵ so, according to Curtin, does the Big Fool find himself in a glen full of magic clouds of mist before the enchanter appears.⁵⁶ Manannán offers the king a magic cup,⁵⁷ and so the enchanter offers a magic cup to the Big Fool.⁵⁸

It may be objected that there is nothing in common between the cup of Manan-

⁴⁹ W. Stokes, *Rev. cell.*, XXIV (1903), 272-87.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

⁵¹ S. H. O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica*, II (London, 1892), 311-24.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. xli-xlii, n. 2.

⁵³ E. O'Curry, *Gael. jour.*, II (Dublin, 1884), 133.

⁵⁴ P. 184.

⁵⁵ W. Stokes, *Irische Texte*, III, Ser. I (Leipzig, 1891), 213.

⁵⁶ P. 153.

⁵⁷ *Irische Texte*, III, 216.

⁵⁸ All versions of the *Lay*.

⁴⁶ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic myth and Arthurian romance* (New York, 1927), p. 111: "It is a recognized principle of Celtic narrative that the same supernatural figure should appear in various forms without revealing his identity at all or until the end."

⁴⁷ ("Irish Texts Society," Vol. I [London, 1890]), pp. ix-x.

⁴⁸ Cf. above, p. 198.

nán and the cup of the enchanter, and this may readily be granted. One cup splits in pieces when lies are told in its presence and reunites when truths are told. The other cup deprives the hero of his legs. Possibly, then, there is no common tradition. Nevertheless, the change in the nature of the enchanter's cup could be explained. One of the most widely spread concepts is that to eat the food or to drink the drink of the Otherworld deprives a mortal of the power to return to the common earth.⁵⁹ Yeats, in his fascinating article *Away*, declares that "you must not go among them [i.e., the fairies] and eat their food, for this will give them power over you."⁶⁰ Again and again in folk tales derived from Cornwall, the Isle of Man, and Ireland the mortal who finds himself in a fairy palace is warned, sometimes by a woman, as in the *Big Fool*, that he must not eat or drink, for if he does he cannot leave. W. Y. E. Wentz—giving independent folk testimony to this effect—tells of an Irish plowman who spent the night among the *sidhe* and admits that he is back to work again only because a woman cautioned him to refuse their food.⁶¹ In the Cornish story, *The fairy dwelling on Selena Moor*, the heroine warns her lover to beware of fairy food, for eating an enchanted plum caused her bewitchment.⁶² The disastrous effect of the fairy drink might very well be interpreted, in terms of normal human locomotion, as losing one's legs. Such an attempt to rationalize the magic power of the enchanted potion would plausibly

explain why and how the Big Fool lost the power of locomotion.

However this may be, the evidence corroborates Campbell's implication that the shape-shifting enchanter was Manannán. It was the traditional formula of Manannán's appearance in various guises that enabled the original composer of the *Lay of the Big Fool* to link together the old Irish tale of Finn and Lomna and the Arthurian tale of the Huntsman and his hound.

THE HISTORY OF THE "LAY"

Of the three elements which went into the *Lay*, two, as we have seen, are native Irish traditions: (1) Finn and his Fool; (2) Manannán the shape-shifter. These must have circulated independently for centuries in oral form. With these was amalgamated an Arthurian version of the Welsh tale of Arawn, the huntsman. Whether this Arthurian narrative reached Ireland in French or English form is difficult to say, for romances of the Round Table in both languages were known. We have not only the Irish translations of French Grail romances published by Professor Robinson but also the testimony of Brian O'Corcoran (seventeenth century),⁶³ the author of *Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair* ("The adventures of eagle boy"), that he had the substance of the tale from a gentleman who had heard it as *Frainnceis*, "out of French."⁶⁴ It is, perhaps, significant also that among the Arthurian names which occur in Irish folk tales, and even in Hyde's version of the *Big Fool* tale, Gawain appears as "Bhalbhuaidh," pronounced, according to O Rathaille, "Walway."⁶⁵ For no form of this name

⁵⁹ Cf. E. Phillpot, *Romania*, XXV (1896), 272; E. S. Hartland, *The science of fairy tales* (New York, 1904), pp. 40, 41, 48, 155.

⁶⁰ *Fortnightly rev.*, LXXVII (London, 1902), 727.

⁶¹ *The fairy-faith in Celtic countries* (New York, 1911), p. 68.

⁶² W. Bottrell, *Traditions and hearthside stories of West Cornwall* (2d ser.; Penzance, 1873), p. 98.

⁶³ Cf. *Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge*, XIX (Dublin, 1909), 191.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 358.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 357, n. 4.

containing an *l* appears, so far as I know, in English texts after the time of La3-amon, whereas Dutch, Italian, and some Latin texts preserve the *l* considerably later. On the other hand, some of the Arthurian influence on Irish folk literature must be English. We find Sir Bhalbhuidh, Sior Bhalbhuidh, and Cing Arthur in certain of these tales, even in Hyde's *Tale of the Big Fool*. If such English words appeared also in the other versions of the *Tale* or in any version of the *Lay* there would be little question about the immediate source of the Arthurian elements. But "Sir" and "Cing" do not appear, and so it seems impossible to decide whether the Arthurianized version of the *Pwyll* episode became known in Ireland through a French or an English medium.

In either case, it was likely to be attracted toward and to merge with the story of Finn and Lomna, because in one tale the host, a huntsman, leaves the hero with his wife; in the other the host goes out hunting and leaves the fool to protect

his wife. Probably sometime in the seventeenth century the fusion was made, and the formula of Manannán's transformations was employed to link the various elements together.⁶⁶ The combination, as put into verse form, came to be known as the *Lay of the Big Fool*. It was attached to the prose tale of the *Big Fool*, which was based on the traditions of Finn's youth and which may have antedated the *Lay*. Popularized by the *scéuluidhe* and *seanchaidhe*, carried throughout Ireland and the Hebrides, the two narratives came down into the nineteenth century, to be collected by folklorists from the mouths of peasant, fisherman, and shepherd and to add to the perplexities of scholars.⁶⁷

NEW YORK CITY

⁶⁶ Hyde (p. 193) points out that, in a song written by Eóghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin to coax a child to sleep, allusion is made to the hunting horn and hound belonging to the *gruagach* in the *Big Fool*. This proves that listeners in the eighteenth century were familiar with the story.

⁶⁷ I am obliged to Professor Roger Sherman Loomis of Columbia University for his assistance in the preparation of this article.

MARCEL PROUST OU L'ANGOISSE CREATRICE

ROBERT VIGNERON

LE PETIT Marcel comprenait fort bien le mécanisme de ses manies et de ses vices: «Il est... à remarquer», devait-il écrire dans *La Prisonnière*, «que la constance d'une habitude est d'ordinaire en rapport avec son absurdité. Les choses éclatantes, on ne les fait généralement que par à-coups. Mais des vies insensées, où le maniaque se prive lui-même de tous les plaisirs et s'inflige les plus grands maux, ces vies sont ce qui change le moins. Tous les dix ans, si l'on en avait la curiosité, on retrouverait le malheureux dormant aux heures où il pourrait vivre, sortant aux heures où il n'y a guère rien d'autre à faire qu'à se laisser assassiner dans les rues, buvant glacé quand il a chaud, toujours en train de soigner un rhume. Il suffirait d'un petit mouvement d'énergie, un seul jour, pour changer cela une fois pour toutes. Mais justement ces vies sont habituellement l'apanage d'êtres incapables d'énergie. Les vices sont un autre aspect de ces existences monotones que la volonté suffirait à rendre moins atroces.¹ Comment donc suppléer à cette grâce nécessaire, à cette indispensable volonté? En faisant appel aux ressources de la psychiatrie. Marcel Proust, semble-t-il, s'était soigneusement documenté sur ce sujet: il avait dépouillé les *Maladies de la volonté* de Ribot, les *Psychonévroses* de Dubois, *Isolement et psychothérapie* de Camus et Pagniez;² et il avait correctement diagnostiqué son cas comme une

neurasthénie dont il ne pourrait se guérir qu'avec l'aide d'un médecin compétent: «On sait», écrivait-il en juin 1905 dans l'article destiné à servir de préface à *Sésame et les Lys*, «que, dans certaines affections du système nerveux, le malade, sans qu'aucun de ses organes soit lui-même atteint, est enlisé dans une sorte d'impossibilité de vouloir, comme dans une ornière profonde d'où il ne peut se tirer seul, et où il finirait par dépérir, si une main puissante et secourable ne lui était tendue. Son cerveau, ses jambes, ses poumons, son estomac sont intacts. Il n'a aucune incapacité réelle de travailler, de marcher, de s'exposer au froid, de manger. Mais ces différents actes, qu'il serait très capable d'accomplir, il est incapable de les vouloir. Et une déchéance organique, qui finirait par devenir l'équivalent des maladies qu'il n'a pas, serait la conséquence irrémédiable de l'inertie de sa volonté, si l'impulsion qu'il ne peut trouver en lui-même ne lui venait du dehors, d'un médecin qui voudra pour lui, jusqu'au jour où seront peu à peu rééduqués ses divers vouloirs organiques.³ Mais encore fallait-il d'abord vouloir se mettre entre les mains du médecin qui se chargerait de la cure.

Cette première et décisive démarche, Marcel Proust, depuis longtemps, se proposait de la faire; mais il la remettait toujours à plus tard. Dès le milieu de novembre 1904, il écrivait à Robert de Montesquiou, à propos de Gabriel de Yturri à qui il avait trouvé très bonne mine: «Je devrais bien suivre son ex-

¹ *La Prisonnière* (Paris: Gallimard, 1923), I, 58. Le présent article est la suite de notre «Marcel Proust et Robert de Montesquiou», *Modern philology*, XXXIX (November, 1941), 159-95.

² Cf. John Ruskin, *Sésame et les Lys*, traduction, notes et préface par Marcel Proust (Paris: Mercure de France, 1906), p. 106, note du traducteur.

³ *Sésame et les Lys*, préface du traducteur, p. 35. Cette préface avait d'abord paru dans la *Renaissance latine*, 15 juin 1905, pp. 379-410, sous le titre de «Sur la lecture».

emple et aller me soigner...⁴ Vers le début de décembre, il annonçait à Louisa de Mornand qu'il devait aller consulter un médecin, et que sa vie allait peut-être s'arranger autrement et lui permettre de mieux voir ceux qu'il aimait.⁵ Mais il s'aperçut bientôt que le remède était pire que le mal: «Je vais de temps en temps voir des médecins qui me disent de partir», écrivit-il une quinzaine de jours plus tard à Mme Émile Straus, «je ne pars pas, mais chaque visite que je leur fais me coûte des semaines entières de lit.»⁶ Vers le milieu de février 1905, il

⁴ A R. de Montesquiou, CXXXVI, Dimanche soir [13 novembre 1904]*, *Correspondance généraux de Marcel Proust* (Paris: Plon, 1930-36), I, 132. Non datée par l'éditeur. Antérieure de peu au premier anniversaire de la maladie et de la mort du Dr Proust, frappé le 24, mort le 26 novembre 1903. Antérieure de peu à une conférence de Montesquiou, laquelle ne peut-être que la conférence sur la gravure en couleurs chez les Japonais, faite le Mardi 22 novembre 1904 à la Galerie Georges Petit: cf. *Gil Blas*, Vendredi 18, et *Figaro*, Mardi 22 novembre 1904. Datée «Dimanche soir» par Proust, la lettre en question a donc vraisemblablement été écrite le Dimanche soir 13 ou moins vraisemblablement le Dimanche soir 20 novembre 1904. Notre récit est fondé sur nos *Problèmes de chronologie proustienne* inédits, auxquels nous empruntons, en les réduisant à la forme la plus schématique, nos démonstrations chronologiques. Nous marquons d'un astérisque les dates que nous avons établies, corrigées ou complétées; mais nous ne répétons pas les démonstrations que nous avons proposées dans nos précédents articles; et nous omettons pour le moment les démonstrations portant sur les lettres auxquelles nous ne renvoyons qu'accessoirement, ainsi que les dates qui n'intéressent pas directement notre exposé.

⁵ Cf. A L. de Mornand, XIII, Vendredi [2 décembre 1904]*, *Correspondance*, V, 167-68. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure à la première représentation de *Maman Colibri* le Mardi 8 novembre 1904 au Vaudeville. Écrite le soir d'une visite au Père-Lachaise, vraisemblablement faite à l'occasion de l'anniversaire de la mort et des obsèques du Dr Proust. Datée «Vendredi» par Proust, la lettre en question a donc probablement été écrite soit le Vendredi 25 novembre soit le Vendredi 2 décembre 1904. Or Proust y annonce qu'il doit aller voir un médecin «lundi»; mais dans la lettre XVIII à la même, incontestablement écrite le Lundi 28 novembre 1904, il n'est point question de cette visite au médecin. Il nous semble donc plus plausible de dater la lettre en question du Vendredi 2 décembre que du Vendredi 25 novembre 1904.

⁶ A Mme É. Straus, XVIII, Mardi soir [20 décembre 1904], *Correspondance*, VI, 20. Proust avait effectivement été voir ses médecins le Lundi 5 décembre et avait écrit le soir même à Montesquiou pour s'excuser de n'avoir pu lui rendre visite l'après-midi:

était enfin à peu près décidé à partir pour Berne faire une cure à la maison de santé du Dr Dubois, l'auteur des *Psychonévroses*, et il refusait sous ce prétexte une invitation pour le 2 mars chez Mme de Ludre.⁷ Mais quinze jours plus tard il était encore à Paris, tout occupé de l'organisation d'un goûter pour le 6 mars. La réunion, très restreinte, fut d'une grande élégance. Robert de Montesquiou, en villégiature depuis quelques semaines en son castel d'Artagnan, n'avait pas été invité; mais du fin fond de sa Gascogne il eut vent de cette résurrection, dont il s'étonna non sans hauteur;⁸ et le pauvre Marcel tout penaud se hâta d'expliquer: «Non, pas une résurrection, un adieu à la vie mondaine, ou plutôt un *alibi mental*. Comme je vais sans doute me décider à aller faire une cure de repos, pour qu'on ne dise pas que j'avais été pris d'un accès de folie et qu'on m'a interné, j'ai réuni des gens

«Malheureusement je n'ai été libre qu'à sept heures. ... Mes rendez-vous avec ces médecins étaient pris et comme j'étais souffrant cela m'a fait, de sortir, beaucoup plus de mal qu'ils ne me feront jamais de bien.» A R. de Montesquiou, CLXXIV, [Lundi soir 5 décembre 1904]*, *Correspondance*, I, 179. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure aux conférences faites par Montesquiou en Amérique durant l'hiver de 1903. Postérieure à la réception d'une invitation à une matinée chez Montesquiou, à laquelle Reynaldo Hahn assistera. Écrite le soir d'une sortie exceptionnelle de Proust pour aller voir ses médecins: vraisemblablement donc écrite le soir de la sortie annoncée dans la lettre XIII à Louisa de Mornand pour le Lundi [5 décembre], l'avant-veille de la matinée donnée le Mercredi 7 décembre par Montesquiou: cf. *Figaro*, Mardi 6 et Jeudi 8 décembre 1904.

⁷ Cf. A Mme de Clermont-Tonnerre, IV, Mercredi soir [1^{er} mars 1905]*, E. de Clermont-Tonnerre, *Robert de Montesquiou et Marcel Proust* (Paris: Flammarion, 1925), p. 108. Non datée par l'éditeur. Antérieure de quelques jours à un thé auquel Proust invite Mme de Clermont-Tonnerre «pour le lundi 6 (lundi prochain à cinq heures)». Ce thé est évidemment celui que Proust devait donner le Lundi 6 mars 1905; et comme la lettre en question est datée «Mercredi soir» par l'expéditeur, elle n'a pu être écrite que le Mercredi soir 1^{er} mars 1905, ou plus précisément dans la nuit du Mercredi 1^{er} au Jeudi 2 mars 1905. Cf. aussi lettre CLXXVIII à R. de Montesquiou, *Correspondance*, I, 186, où Proust parle de son départ éventuel «pour quelque maison de nerveux».

⁸ Sur cette affaire, voir notre «Marcel Proust et Robert de Montesquiou».

pour leur montrer que je partirais sain d'esprit (si tant est que je l'aie jamais été) et par ma volonté (si tant est qu'on fasse quelque chose par sa volonté).⁹ Mais à la fin du mois il n'était toujours point parti, et, prétextant le printemps commencé, il penchait à s'accorder un sursis: «Je vais malheureusement être obligé d'aller dans une sorte de sanatorium pour y passer trois ou quatre mois», écrivit-il alors à Mme Straus, «mais je crois que je remettrai cela après ma fièvre des foins.»¹⁰ Entre temps, Mme Straus, elle-même une grande nerveuse, se rendait en Suisse, à Territet, pour y subir un traitement de plusieurs mois sous la direction du Dr Widmer. Or c'était précisément chez le Dr Widmer que Proust pensait aller lui aussi faire sa cure; mais point avant l'automne: «Car», expliqua-t-il au début d'avril à Mme Straus, «j'ai trop attendu, et maintenant je ne pourrais circuler au milieu des pays qui vont fleurir.» Certes il espérait que Widmer, dont on lui avait dit du bien, pourrait beaucoup pour elle; mais, pour sa part, il n'en attendait plus grand'chose: «Car je sais bien que ces crises incessantes ont détruit dans mon organisme des choses qui ne pourront plus se refaire. Mais enfin, s'il me donne une vie plus supportable, ce sera déjà beaucoup.»¹¹ A la fin de juin, il prévoyait toujours son départ pour l'automne; et, annonçant à Marie Nordlinger qu'il ne pouvait différer plus longtemps d'envoyer au *Mercure* le manuscrit de *Sésame et les Lys*, il expliquait mélancoliquement: «Il ne peut plus paraître maintenant, il est trop tard; mais je puis toujours le faire imprimer pour que, si cet hiver je suis dans une maison de repos,

il puisse paraître sans moi, *vox silentis*.»¹² Le 28 juillet, il dut s'arracher à la «vie fantastique» qu'il menait—ne sortant plus jamais et se levant à onze heures du soir quand il se levait—pour aller assister, à onze heures du matin, aux obsèques de la duchesse de Gramont; il profita de cette sortie pour aller l'après-midi consulter le Dr Brissaud, qui lui recommanda le Dr Sollier, spécialiste des maladies nerveuses, lequel avait un sanatorium à Boulogne-sur-Seine. Mais cet effort insolite lui valut une espèce de bronchite qui réveilla et aggrava son asthme; et pendant quelques jours il se trouva fort mal en point, ce qui le confirma dans son scepticisme en médecine et lui inspira le projet de faire un livre sur les médecins.¹³

Cependant l'automne approchait; et le malade se rendit compte qu'il ne pouvait plus tergiverser. Pourrait-il ces jours-ci voir un moment Louisa de Mornand, qui venait de rentrer de Trouville? ou bien pourrait-il après les vacances la voir d'une façon régulière et fréquente? Ce n'était-là, écrivit-il vers la fin d'août à son amie, qu'un aspect particulier de cette autre question qu'il était enfin temps de résoudre: «Continuerai-je jusqu'à ma mort à mener une vie que même des malades gravement malades ne mènent pas, privé de tout, de la lumière du jour, de l'air, de tout travail, de tout plaisir, en un mot de toute vie. Ou vais-je trouver un moyen pour changer? Je ne peux plus ajourner la réponse, car ce n'est pas seulement ma jeunesse, c'est ma vie qui passe...» Et il se déclarait «plutôt favorable» à ne pas retarder la solution qui lui permettrait par la suite de mener une vie plus nor-

⁹ A R. de Montesquiou, CCI, [Lundi soir 6 mars 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 223.

¹⁰ A Mme Straus, XIX, [Jeudi 23 mars 1905], *Correspondance*, VI, 22.

¹¹ A Mme Straus, XX, Dimanche soir [9 avril 1905], *Correspondance*, VI, 25.

¹² A Miss Mary Nordlinger, XXXIV, Samedi [24 juin 1905], *Lettres à une amie* (Manchester: Editions du Calame, 1942), p. 90. Cf. aussi lettre à R. de Montesquiou, XLVII, Dimanche soir [25 juin 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 42.

¹³ Cf. A Mme de Noailles, XXVI, [Peu après Vendredi 28 juillet 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 138-40; et à R. de Montesquiou, CLIV, [Peu après Vendredi 28 juillet 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 155.

male:¹⁴ c'est-à-dire une cure dans un sanatorium pour maladies nerveuses. Mais pour l'obliger à vouloir il fallut apparemment l'impulsion extérieure dont il parlait dans son article «Sur la lecture»: l'intervention, non point peut-être d'un médecin, mais bien plutôt de son incomparable mère. Ce fut-elle, semble-t-il, qui, vers les premiers jours de septembre, le décida à partir pour Evian, d'où il devait ensuite passer en Suisse pour y entreprendre sa cure; et, avec son dévouement habituel, elle l'accompagna dans son voyage.

Cela devait être le suprême effort de Mme Proust pour sauver son fils. Depuis des années, les misères physiques et les défaillances morales de Marcel avaient été son obsession; et, depuis qu'elle avait dû abdiquer devant son insurmontable nervosisme et renoncer à tous les projets d'avenir qu'elle avait formés pour lui, elle s'était faite son esclave. Elle avait encouragé ses travaux ruskiniens: elle l'avait poussé à traduire *La Bible d'Amiens*, et, comme il ne savait pas l'anglais, elle s'était imposé la tâche de lui traduire mot à mot le texte original, remplissant de sa fine écriture plusieurs cahiers d'écolier, sur lesquels il peina ensuite avec Marie Nordlinger et Robert d'Humières;¹⁵ et, après la mort du Dr Proust, lorsque Marcel avait voulu renoncer à publier sa traduction, elle avait insisté pour qu'il se remit à ses épreuves, affirmant que la publication de cet ouvrage était tout ce que son père désirait et

attendait de jour en jour.¹⁶ Elle s'était discrètement prêtée à sa liaison avec Louisa de Mornand, la jeune actrice du Vaudeville qui venait parfois le voir le soir après le théâtre: quand elle était prévenue d'une de ces visites, Mme Proust se couchait, pour laisser plus libres ces jeunes gens qu'elle ne pouvait manquer de croire amants;¹⁷ peut-être espérait-elle que des amours normales parviendraient à guérir son fils des tristes goûts qu'elle lui soupçonnait sans doute; mais, à part quelques polissonneries, il semble bien que Marcel n'ait fait de Louisa, qui d'ailleurs avait un protecteur en titre, qu'une sorte de fausse maîtresse destinée à donner le change sur des divertissements moins avouables. Pour épargner au malade la moindre fatigue, il n'est point de corvée que Mme Proust n'acceptât: il lui faisait faire ses courses, l'expédiant un jour chez Léon Daudet lui porter quelque paquet, l'envoyant un autre jour à Neuilly prendre des nouvelles de Gabriel de Yturri, la chargeant une autre fois de reconduire Marie Nordlinger à Auteuil; et il se remettait sur elle du soin d'organiser ses dîners et d'inviter ses convives pendant qu'il dormait.¹⁸ Sur son repos, elle veillait avec une inlassable vigilance, faisant régner toute la journée dans l'appartement le silence le plus profond; mais,

¹⁴ Cf. A Mme de Noailles, Jeudi [3 décembre 1903]*, *Correspondance*, II, 51. Datée (1903) par l'éditeur. Postérieure d'une semaine à la mort du Dr Proust le Jeudi 26 novembre 1903: allusion à l'énergie de Mme Proust, telle «qu'il n'y a aucune différence entre elle il y a huit jours et elle aujourd'hui». Datée «Jeudi» par Proust, elle a nécessairement été écrite le Jeudi qui suivit le premier Dimanche postérieur à la mort du Dr Proust: allusion à une discussion politique de Marcel avec son père d'autre dimanches, c'est-à-dire le Dimanche 22 novembre 1903.

¹⁷ Cf. A L. de Mornand, XX, *Correspondance*, V, 174.

¹⁸ Cf. A Lucien Daudet, XXVII, *Autour de soixante lettres de Marcel Proust* (Paris: Gallimard, 1929), p. 153; au même, XXXIII, *ibid.*, p. 168; à Mlle Nordlinger, XXVIII, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 70; à R. de Montesquiou, CLII, *Correspondance*, I, 152; au même, CXXV, *ibid.*, p. 177.

¹⁴ A L. de Mornand, X, [Vers fin août 1905]*, *Correspondance*, V, 164-65. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure à la lettre VII à la même, écrite pendant un séjour de Louisa de Mornand à Trouville et que nous datons du début d'août 1905. Apparemment postérieure au retour de l'actrice à Paris, sans doute après la clôture de la Grande Semaine et pour le début des répétitions de *La belle Madame Héber*, dont la première représentation devait avoir lieu le 15 septembre 1905. Antérieure au départ de Proust pour Evian vers les premiers jours de septembre.

¹⁵ Cf. Marie Nordlinger, *Lettres à une amie*, «Au lecteur», p. viii.

mettait-il le pied hors de sa chambre, il y avait dans le couloir une lame de parquet sur laquelle on ne pouvait marcher sans la faire crier, et Mme Proust aux aguets aussitôt l'entendait et faisait à Marcel avec la bouche ce petit bruit qui signifie: Viens m'embrasser.¹⁹ S'il recevait après dîner, dans la salle à manger familiale où il travaillait parfois le soir, la visite de quelques jeunes gens, elle entraînait un moment, avec la réserve, la discrétion et l'opportunité qu'elle mettait en toute chose, disait aux amis de son fils un mot toujours charmant, improvisé pour chacun d'eux; et, avant de se retirer, elle faisait quelques prudentes recommandations: «Mon cher petit, si tu sors ce soir, couvre-toi bien... il fait très froid... ayez soin de lui, n'est-ce pas, Monsieur Un Tel, il a eu tout à l'heure une crise d'étouffement...»²⁰ Sortait-il en effet, en rentrant son premier mot était: «Madame est là?», et, avant qu'on pût lui répondre, il l'apercevait qui attendait anxieusement pour voir s'il reviendrait sans trop de crise, et qui n'osait lui adresser la parole, de peur de le faire parler, s'il était oppressé.²¹

Certes, il l'aimait jalousement, cette mère trop sublime qui mettait son bonheur et son orgueil à se faire sa servante: quand il lui disait bonsoir, «il l'embrassait avec une adoration enfantine, lente, passionnée, comme s'il voulait chaque soir reprendre des forces dans les bras qui l'avaient bercé.»²² Mais cette adoration était égoïste et aveugle, autant qu'étaient inconsciemment féroces l'indolence avec laquelle il se faisait servir et la veulerie

avec laquelle il s'abandonnait à ses vices. Ce fils si tendre ne s'apercevait point que sa mère s'épuisait; et que, depuis qu'elle avait perdu, près de deux ans auparavant, son mari, continuer à vivre avait été pour elle un effort chaque jour plus pénible, un effort qu'elle n'avait tenté que pour ses enfants et que bientôt elle ne pourrait plus tenter, si grande était sa lassitude.

C'est vers les premiers jours de septembre que Marcel, en compagnie de sa mère, partit pour Evian, très souffrant mais aussi très optimiste, car il venait de recevoir une lettre délicieuse de Mme Straus, qui l'avait recommandé au Dr Widmer. Deux heures après leur arrivée, Mme Proust était prise de vomissements et de vertiges, qui semblaient trahir quelque désordre grave. Mais cette âme intrépide refusa de se laisser abattre. Il fut impossible d'obtenir d'elle qu'elle vît un médecin, qu'elle laissât faire une analyse. Malgré ces premiers accidents, malgré des vertiges persistants, malgré les supplications de son fils, elle s'obstina pendant plusieurs jours à descendre dès le matin au salon de l'Hôtel, chancelante, soutenue par deux domestiques.²³ Marcel, de son côté, était aussi tombé malade, et s'inquiétait fort de l'état et des imprudences de sa mère. Enfin, le Dr Robert Proust vint chercher la malade et la ramena à Paris; mais elle refusa de laisser Marcel rentrer avec eux. Il resta donc quelques jours encore à Evian, seul, dans l'angoisse de savoir qu'elle souffrait loin de lui, et dans l'attente d'une dépêche qui le rappellerait d'urgence à Paris. «J'espère que cela se dissipera comme un mauvais rêve», écrivait-il le 13 septembre à Marie Nord-

¹⁹ Cf. A. R. de Montesquiou, CLX, *Correspondance*, I, 162; à Mme de Noailles, XX, *Correspondance*, II, 108.

²⁰ Lucien Daudet, *Autour de soixante lettres*, Avant-propos, p. 35.

²¹ Cf. A. Mme Straus, XXV, *Correspondance*, VI, 40.

²² Lucien Daudet, *Autour de soixante lettres*, Avant-propos, pp. 35-36.

²³ Cf. A. Mme Straus, XXIV, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 37-38. Datée [Septembre 1905] par l'éditeur. Postérieure au retour de Mme Proust à Paris, annoncé le Mardi 19 septembre 1905 dans le *Figaro*; postérieure au retour de Marcel lui-même à Paris. Antérieure de quelques jours à la mort de Mme Proust, annoncée le Mercredi 27 septembre dans le *Figaro*.

linger, «mais, tant qu'il dure, je suis bien malheureux.»²⁴

Ce n'était pas un mauvais rêve. Les examens et les analyses faits à Paris révélèrent que Mme Proust souffrait d'une grave crise d'urémie, qu'avait encore aggravée son voyage de retour, accompli dans de déplorables conditions. Marcel, ne pouvant plus supporter le tourment d'être loin d'elle, peut-être aussi rappelé par son frère, rentra à son tour à Paris. Il trouva sa mère dans un état de faiblesse extrême, qui ne prévalait point cependant contre une indomptable volonté. C'est à peine si elle consentait à voir le docteur, elle refusait le moindre médicament, elle repoussait depuis quinze jours toute nourriture; mais elle n'en continuait pas moins à se faire lever, laver, habiller tous les jours.²⁵ Pour animer encore ce corps défaillant sans doute trouvait-elle quelque force dans son insatiable besoin, plus aveugle et plus vivace qu'un instinct, de persister à veiller sur le fils qu'elle considérait encore comme un petit enfant: car, comme le disait la Sœur qui la soignait, pour elle il n'avait toujours que quatre ans.²⁶ Bien des années plus tard, pour exprimer sa lassitude au moment où il sent que les forces de l'écrivain ne sont plus chez lui à la hauteur des exigences égoïstes de l'œuvre, l'auteur du *Temps retrouvé* proposera cette comparaison effroyable: «Mon œuvre était pour moi comme un fils dont la mère mourante doit encore s'imposer la fatigue de s'occuper sans cesse, entre les piqures et les ven-

touses. Elle l'aime peut-être encore, mais ne le sait plus que par le devoir excédant qu'elle a de s'occuper de lui.»²⁷ Comment ne pas reconnaître là un souvenir, et un remords?

Cependant, une légère amélioration se produisit, et le médecin assura que si la malade triomphait de cette crise, elle retrouverait sa santé d'autrefois; mais Marcel avait bien de la peine à le croire; le lendemain, l'amélioration s'était maintenue, sans toutefois s'accroître; et, en l'annonçant à Montesquiou, il ajoutait qu'ils restaient bien inquiets et bien malheureux.²⁸ Le mieux persista; mais la guérison semblait encore bien loin: «Quelle espoir que la petite amélioration de ces jours-ci nous donne (et je ne peux pas vous dire combien ce mot espoir m'est délicieux, il semble me rendre la possibilité de continuer à vivre)», écrivit alors Marcel à Montesquiou, «des abîmes où nous étions la pente sera si longue à remonter, que le progrès de chaque jour, si Dieu veut qu'il continue, sera insensible.» Leur espoir, Marcel et Robert auraient voulu pouvoir le dire et le faire partager à leur mère, mais ils n'y parvinrent pas: «Peut-être ne nous croirait-elle pas. En tout cas, son calme absolu nous empêche de savoir ce qu'elle croit et ce qu'elle souffre.»²⁹

Ce qu'elle souffrait, s'il ne le savait pas, Marcel du moins le soupçonnait, avec horreur. Dans la lettre où il annonçait à Mme Straus la légère amélioration survenue la veille, il laissait déjà échapper ses craintes à ce sujet: «Je suis sûr... que

²⁴ A Mlle Nordlinger, XXXVII, Evian-les-Bains, [Mercredi 13 septembre 1905], *Lettres à une amie*, pp. 101-2. Cf. aussi lettre à R. de Montesquiou, CLVIII, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 160.

²⁵ Cf. A Mme Straus, XXIV, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 38; et à R. de Billy, XXIII, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Lettres et conversations* (Paris: Editions des Portiques, 1930), pp. 153-54.

²⁶ Cf. A R. de Montesquiou, CLX, [Vers premiers jours de novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 163.

²⁷ *Temps retrouvé* (Paris: Gallimard, 1927), II, 253.

²⁸ Cf. A Mme Straus, XXIV, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 39; et à R. de Montesquiou, CXXVIII, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 120. Les deux lettres ont manifestement été écrites le même jour.

²⁹ A R. de Montesquiou, CLIX, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 161. Cette lettre est apparemment postérieure à la lettre CXXVIII au même et à la lettre XXIV à Mme Straus.

moralement elle souffre horriblement. J'avais toujours souhaité de ne mourir qu'après elle pour qu'elle n'ait pas le chagrin de me perdre. Mais je ne sais pas si l'anxiété où elle est de penser qu'elle va peut-être nous quitter, me laisser si peu capable d'être seul dans la vie, qu'elle vivra peut-être incomplètement, fragile, tout cela doit la torturer peut-être encore davantage. Dans tout ce que j'ai imaginé de plus triste quand j'essayais d'anticiper les douleurs futures, je n'avais jamais redouté cela.³⁰ Et quelques jours plus tard il confiait à Montesquiou: «Elle me sait si incapable de vivre sans elle, si désarmé de toutes façons devant la vie, que si elle a eu, comme j'en ai la peur et l'angoisse, le sentiment qu'elle allait peut-être me quitter pour jamais, elle a dû connaître des minutes anxieuses et atroces qui me sont à imaginer le plus horrible supplice.»³¹ Horrible supplice que, par une étonnante prémonition, il avait éprouvé près de deux mois auparavant par sympathie, à l'occasion de la mort de la duchesse de Gramont, née Rothschild, laquelle, bien que convertie au catholicisme, avait en mourant considéré comme éthernelle sa séparation d'avec sa fille Corisande. C'est vers les premiers jours d'août qu'il écrivait à la comtesse Mathieu de Noailles, à propos de la comtesse Hélié de Noailles, née Gramont, à qui il n'avait pu présenter ses condoléances le jour des obsèques: «J'aurais voulu savoir où est votre belle-sœur, car j'aurais voulu lui écrire, n'ayant pu lui serrer la main l'autre jour. Je me rappelle la tendresse de sa mère pour elle. La pensée que sa mère a su—ou a cru—qu'elle la quittait pour l'éternité, que plus jamais dans les siècles des siècles elle ne la reverrait, est une

pensée qui me rend fou.»³² Et maintenant la même tragédie se répétait dans sa propre vie: car Mme Proust, restée fidèle à la foi de son père et de sa mère, devait croire elle aussi qu'elle allait «quitter pour jamais» ce fils qui avait tant besoin de ses soins incessants et sur lequel elle aurait voulu pouvoir continuer à veiller du fond de l'au-delà.

Le mieux ne dura pas. Ce calme imperturbable, que la malade avait opposé aux souffrances de sa chair et aux angoisses de ses enfants, se transforma en un assoupissement dont rien ne semblait plus la devoir tirer. Rien, sauf, toujours aux aguets dans ce corps exténué qui glissait au néant, l'amour maternel encore capable parfois de galvaniser la matière inerte: ma mère, racontera plus tard Marcel Proust en attribuant ce trait à la grand'mère de son héros, «dans les derniers jours qui précédèrent sa mort et où elle était plongée dans une immobilité que rien ne troublait et que les médecins appelaient le coma, se mettait, m'a-t-on dit, à trembler un instant comme une feuille quand elle entendait les trois coups de sonnette par lesquels j'avais l'habitude d'appeler Françoise, et que, même en les faisant plus légers cette semaine-là pour ne pas troubler le silence de la chambre mortuaire, personne, assurait Françoise, ne pouvait confondre, à cause d'une manière que j'avais et ignorais moi-même d'appuyer sur le timbre, avec les coups de sonnette de quelqu'un d'autre.»³³

Elle succomba enfin, le mardi 26 septembre 1905. Reynaldo Hahn, accouru auprès de son ami, devait toujours se le

³⁰ A Mme Straus, XXIV, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 39.

³¹ A R. de Montesquiou, CLIX, [Peu avant Mardi 26 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 161. Cf. *ci-dessus* n. 29.

³² A Mme de Noailles, XXVI, [Peu après Vendredi 28 juillet 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 140. Marcel Proust avait assisté aux obsèques de la duchesse de Gramont, née Marguerite-Alexandrine de Rothschild, célébrées le 28 juillet à Saint-Pierre-de-Chailot: cf. *Figaro*, Samedi 29 juillet 1905. Corisande de Gramont avait épousé le 2 juillet 1901 le comte Hélié de Noailles, devenant ainsi la belle-sœur de la comtesse Mathieu de Noailles, née Brancovan.

³³ *La Prisonnière*, II, 271-72.

rappeler, près du lit de sa mère, pleurant, et souriant au cadavre à travers ses larmes.³⁴ Durant les deux jours qu'il lui fut permis de la garder, il ne s'arracha d'après d'elle que pour écrire son malheur à ses amis. A Mme de Noailles il écrivit le mercredi 27 septembre, la veille de l'enterrement: «Elle meurt à cinquante-six ans, en paraissant trente depuis que la maladie l'avait maigrie et surtout depuis que la mort lui a rendu sa jeunesse d'avant ses chagrins; elle n'avait pas un cheveu blanc. Elle emporte ma vie avec elle, comme papa avait emporté la sienne. Elle a voulu lui survivre pour nous et n'a pas pu.» Et, comptant les heures qui lui restaient avant de la voir partir, il ajoutait avec une déchirante simplicité: «Aujourd'hui je l'ai encore, morte mais recevant encore mes tendresses. Et puis je ne l'aurai jamais plus.»³⁵

Les obsèques eurent lieu le jeudi 28, selon le rite israélite. Le cortège se rendit directement de la maison mortuaire au cimetière du Père-Lachaise. «Le deuil», raconta le *Figaro* du lendemain, «était conduit par M. Marcel Proust et le docteur Robert Proust, professeur agrégé à la Faculté de médecine, fils de la défunte; par M. G. Denis Weil, conseiller à la Cour d'appel, son frère. Le char disparaissait sous les couronnes. Parmi les plus belles, celles du marquis d'Albuféra, de Mme Félix Faure, de Mme Gaston Thomson.» Dans l'assistance, on remarquait les professeurs Brouardel, Berger, Pozzi, Dentu, Fournier, Dieulafoy, Hartmann, ainsi que le comte et la comtesse de Noailles, le comte et la comtesse de Cheigné, le marquis et la marquise d'Albuféra, le vicomte et la vicomtesse de Grouchy:

³⁴ Cf. Reynaldo Hahn, *Notes* (*Journal d'un musicien*) (Paris: Plon, 1933), p. 99.

³⁵ A Mme de Noailles, XIX, [Mercredi 27 septembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 106-7. Datée (1905) pas l'éditeur. La date précise se déduit de l'allusion aux obsèques, qui doivent avoir lieu le lendemain.

bref, la plupart des grands noms de la médecine et du monde.³⁶

Marcel rentra dans l'appartement à jamais désert, seul avec son deuil. Il dut s'aliter, et pendant des jours et des semaines il lui fut impossible de sortir, impossible même de se lever. A Louisa de Mornand, qui avait envoyé une immense couronne de fleurs, il trouva cependant la force d'adresser quelques remerciements: «Couché depuis plusieurs jours, je ne puis écrire bien, aussi je veux tracer ces quelques mots illisibles, les premiers que j'écris, les seuls que j'écrirai de quelque temps, pour vous dire que je n'oublierai jamais de ma vie que vous avez voulu rendre hommage à la mémoire de maman ...»; et c'est à elle aussi qu'il confia la première effusion du désespoir et de la solitude de son âme: «Vous pouvez deviner dans quelle détresse je me trouve, vous qui m'avez vu toujours les oreilles et le cœur aux écoutes sur la chambre de maman, où sous tous les prétextes je retournais sans cesse l'embrasser, où maintenant je l'ai vue morte, heureux encore d'avoir pu ainsi l'embrasser encore. Et maintenant la chambre est vide et mon cœur et la vie.»³⁷ Puis il s'enferma farouchement dans ses souvenirs. De tout son cœur, de toutes ses forces il s'efforçait d'évoquer l'ombre chérie; mais en vain: «L'excès même du besoin que j'ai de la revoir», confia-t-il au début de novembre à Montesquiou, «m'empêche de rien apercevoir devant mes yeux quand je pense à elle, sauf, depuis deux jours, deux visions particulièrement douloureuses de sa maladie.» Ces images, qui l'obsédaient dans l'insomnie, se faisaient plus affreuses

³⁶ Cf. *Figaro*, Vendredi 29 septembre 1905.

³⁷ A L. de Mornand, XXIV, [Vers premiers jours d'octobre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, V, 177-78. Non datée par l'éditeur. La date se déduit des remerciements pour la couronne, et de l'explication que donne Proust de son retard à les envoyer: il est couché depuis plusieurs jours et ce sont les premiers mots qu'il écrit.

encore s'il parvenait à s'assoupir, car la censure cessait alors de jouer: «Je ne peux plus dormir», poursuivait-il, «et si, par hasard, je m'endors, le sommeil, moins ménager de la douleur que mon intelligence éveillée, m'accable de pensées atroces que du moins, quand je suis éveillé, ma raison essaye de doser, et de contredire quand je ne peux plus les supporter.»³⁸ Quelques jours après, c'est à Mme Straus qu'il expliquait ce supplice du souvenir: «Quand l'anxiété qui s'y mêle est trop forte et me rend fou, je tâche de la diriger, de la diminuer. Mais depuis quelques jours je redors un peu. Alors dans le sommeil l'intelligence n'est plus là pour écarter un souvenir trop angoissant pour un instant, pour doser la douleur, la mêler de douceur; alors je suis sans défense aux impressions les plus atroces.»³⁹ Ce sont ces cauchemars qu'il devait plus tard évoquer dans *Sodome et Gomorrhe* avec un pathétique si déchirant: «Dès que je fus arrivé à m'endormir, à cette heure, plus véridique, où mes yeux se fermèrent aux choses du dehors, le monde du sommeil (sur le seuil duquel l'intelligence et la volonté momentanément paralysées ne pouvaient plus me disputer à la cruauté de mes impressions véritables), réfléchit, réfracta la douloureuse synthèse de la survivance et du néant, dans la profondeur organique et devenue translucide des viscères mystérieusement éclairés. Monde du sommeil où la connaissance interne, placée sous la dé-

pendance des troubles de nos organes, accélére le rythme du cœur ou de la respiration, parce qu'une même dose d'effroi, de tristesse, de remords agit avec une puissance centuplée, si elle est ainsi injectée dans nos veines; dès que pour y parcourir les artères de la cité souterraine nous nous sommes embarqués sur les flots noirs de notre propre sang comme sur un Léthé intérieur aux sextuples replis, de grandes figures solennelles nous apparaissent, nous abordent et nous quittent, nous laissant en larmes.»⁴⁰

Parfois cependant une détente se produisait, il lui semblait qu'il était habitué à son malheur, qu'il allait reprendre goût à la vie, et il se le reprochait; mais à la même minute une nouvelle douleur s'abat-tait sur lui, et lui révélait l'infinie multiplicité de chacun de nos sentiments, que peuvent à tout instant renouveler d'innombrables associations d'idées: car, ainsi qu'il l'expliqua au début de novembre à Mme Straus, «on n'a pas un chagrin, le regret prend à tout instant une autre forme, à chaque instant, suggéré par telle impression identique à une impression d'autrefois, c'est un nouveau malheur, un mal inconnu, atroce comme la première fois.»⁴¹ Cette multiplicité du chagrin, il la ressentit plus vivement encore quand il put commencer à se lever et à faire quelques pas hors de sa chambre: «Je suis allé dans certaines pièces de l'appartement où le hasard fait que je n'étais pas retourné», écrivit-il vers la fin de novembre à Mme de Noailles, «et j'ai exploré des parts inconnues de mon chagrin, qui s'étend toujours plus infini au fur et à mesure que je m'y avance.»⁴² Mais rien peut-être ne lui faisait éprouver plus profondément le sentiment de son irrémédiable-

³⁸ A R. de Montesquiou, CLX, [Vers premiers jours de novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 163. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure de quelque temps à la mort de Mme Proust. Postérieure au retour de Montesquiou à Paris annoncé le 11 octobre dans le *Figaro*. Antérieure à la première sortie de Proust après son deuil: promet à Montesquiou d'aller le voir dès qu'il pourra parler et se lever. Apparemment antérieure de quelques jours à la lettre XXV à Mme Straus, datée [9 novembre 1905] par l'éditeur: fait allusion aux mêmes obsessions atroces, mais déclare qu'il ne peut plus dormir, alors que dans la lettre à Mme Straus il écrit que, «depuis quelques jours», il redort un peu.

³⁹ A Mme Straus, XXV, [9 novembre 1905], *Correspondance*, VI, 41.

⁴⁰ *Sodome et Gomorrhe* (Paris: Gallimard, 1922), II*, 182-83.

⁴¹ A Mme Straus, XXV, [9 novembre 1905], *Correspondance*, VI, 41.

⁴² A Mme de Noailles, XX, [Vers fin novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 108.

able perte que d'écouter le silence de l'appartement, où les domestiques stylés par sa mère continuaient à glisser à pas feutrés, comme des ombres: «Ma vie a désormais perdu son seul but, sa seule douceur, son seul amour, sa seule consolation», avait-il écrit au début de novembre à Montesquiou, «j'ai perdu celle dont la vigilance incessante m'apportait en paix, en tendresse, le seul miel de la vie que je goûte encore par moments avec horreur dans ce silence qu'elle savait faire régner si profond toute la journée autour de mon sommeil et que l'habitude des domestiques qu'elle avait formés fait encore survivre, inerte, à son activité finie.»⁴³

Si poignants qu'il soient, ces cris de douleur sont encore les cris d'une douleur égoïste qui, dans la mort d'un être chéri, ne déplore que sa propre peine et sa propre privation. Mais cependant, de cette âme encore si puérile et si lâche commencent à jaillir aussi quelques gémissements de honte et de remords, si sincères qu'ils annoncent peut-être une prochaine rédemption. Dès le début de novembre, dans un irrésistible élan d'effusion et de confession, il écrit à quelques jours d'intervalle à Montesquiou et à Mme Straus. A celle-ci il rappelle avec quelle anxiété sa mère, quand il sortait, l'attendait pour s'assurer qu'il rentrait sans trop de crise, et il confie la torture que sont maintenant pour lui ces souvenirs: «Hélas, c'est ce souci qui ajoutait à ses tristesses, qui me ronge maintenant de remords et m'empêche de trouver une seconde de douceur dans le souvenir de nos heures de tendresse, que je ne peux pas même dire qui est incessant, car c'est en lui que je respire, que je pense, il est seul autour de moi.»⁴⁴ A Robert de Montesquiou il avoue, avec ses propres

souffrances, la crainte qu'il a maintenant d'avoir été pour sa mère une cause incessante de tourment: «J'ai été abreuvé de toutes les douleurs, je l'ai perdue, je l'ai vue souffrir, je peux croire qu'elle a su qu'elle me quittait et qu'elle n'a pu me faire des recommandations qu'il était peut-être angoissant pour elle de taire, j'ai le sentiment que par ma mauvaise santé j'ai été le chagrin et le souci de sa vie; dans son désespoir, il considère comme une grâce d'être celui qui survit et qui souffre: «Une seule chose m'a été épargnée», explique-t-il: «Je n'ai pas eu le tourment de mourir avant elle et de sentir l'horreur que cela aurait été pour elle; mais il se demande si le tourment de le laisser seul au monde n'a pas été plus affreux encore pour sa mère: «Me quitter pour l'éternité, me sentant si peu capable de lutter dans la vie, a dû être pour elle un bien grand supplice aussi. Elle a dû comprendre la sagesse des parents qui, avant de mourir, tuent leurs petits enfants.»⁴⁵

Cette conscience d'avoir par son égoïsme fait depuis si longtemps souffrir sa mère finit par lui donner le courage d'essayer de réformer sa vie. Il n'a plus d'autre ambition ici-bas que de faire ce que sa mère aurait aimé qu'il fit. Il songe donc de nouveau, vers la fin de novembre, à ses projets de cure; il s'informe auprès de Mme de Noailles de la valeur respective des Drs Sollier et Dubois; il voudrait surtout savoir si Sollier consentirait à le soigner à domicile: «Mais ne le lui demandez pas», recommande-t-il, «car je suis déjà engagé avec tant d'autres!»⁴⁶ Quelques jours plus tard, il est en effet définitivement engagé avec le Dr Déjerine: sa chambre est retenue à la clinique

⁴³ A R. de Montesquiou, CLX, [Vers premiers jours de novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 163.

⁴⁴ A R. de Montesquiou, CLX, [Vers premiers jours de novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, I, 162.

⁴⁵ A Mme Straus, XXV, [Jeudi 9 novembre 1905], *Correspondance*, VI, 40.

⁴⁶ A Mme de Noailles, XX, [Vers fin novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 109. Datée (1905) par l'éditeur. Antérieure de peu à l'entrée de Proust à la clinique du Dr Sollier, où il est déjà installé le 6 décembre 1905. Cf. ci-dessous n. 49.

que de la rue Blomet, où il doit entrer pour une cure de trois mois, dans l'isolement le plus complet. Mais au dernier moment, le jour même où il doit se rendre à la clinique, il est pris de panique et fait appel à Mme Straus en la priant de s'entremettre immédiatement auprès du Dr Sollier: il se demande si ce dernier ne voudrait pas, beaucoup plus simplement, sans l'isoler, sans le faire entrer à sa clinique, rien qu'en changeant ses heures, ses repas, etc., essayer de le rendre un peu plus capable d'une vie normale; mais il se rend bien compte au fond que tout le talent de Sollier n'accomplira pas ce qu'accomplirait une cure radicale. Mme Straus agit aussitôt, et lui fit dire que le Dr Sollier irait le voir le lendemain. Cette nouvelle redoubla les hésitations du malade: «Je crois que je le laisserai venir», répondit-il à Mme Straus, après s'être confondu en protestations de reconnaissance; et il entreprit de lui exposer en détail la «raison majeure» qui l'avait poussé au dernier moment à une démarche si pressante. En fait, cette raison majeure semble bien se réduire à son invincible aboulie et à son épouvante de l'isolement rigoureux que lui imposera Déjerine: «J'ai de trop bonnes raisons», explique-t-il à Mme Straus, «malheureux comme je suis, de craindre l'isolement et le dépaysement. Je vous dis tout cela pour que vous soyez persuadée que je ne me serais pas permis de vous demander cela brusquement, ainsi, pour le jour même (je ne suis pas si mal élevé) s'il n'y avait eu qu'une raison de nerfs. Il y avait cette raison grave.» Cependant, maintenant que Sollier est alerté, il ne sait encore à quoi se résoudre: «Alors, si je me décide à refuser à tout hasard Déjerine, ou à le faire attendre encore, je n'ai rien à téléphoner à M. Sollier, et je l'attends demain à 6 heures et demie, n'est-ce pas?»⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Cf. A. Mme Straus, XXVI, [Vers tout premiers jours de décembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 42-44. Datée [Vers décembre 1905] par l'éditeur. Immé-

Pour empêcher Sollier de venir, il eût fallu téléphoner, c'est-à-dire agir: Marcel Proust, apparemment, resta inerte. Le Dr Sollier vint donc le voir le lendemain, et se comporta comme le psychiatre décrit quelques mois auparavant par son client lui-même: il voulut pour le malade, et le fit le jour même entrer à son sanatorium de Boulogne-sur-Seine.⁴⁸ Le 6 décembre, Marcel faisait écrire à Marie Nordlinger: «Monsieur Marcel Proust est en traitement dans une maison de santé où il est défendu d'écrire, mais il tient à ce que Mademoiselle Mary sache qu'il n'a jamais cessé de penser à elle avec tendresse, respect et reconnaissance.»⁴⁹ A Louisa de Mornand il écrivait lui-même vers la même date: «Je reçois votre lettre dans une maison de santé où je viens d'entrer et où je ne pourrai écrire. C'est une exception absolue que je fais par tendresse pour vous en vous écrivant ce petit mot.»⁵⁰ Il fit cependant la même exception quelque temps après en écrivant à Robert de Billy qu'il pouvait venir le voir le mardi, le jeudi et le samedi de 2 à 4: «Ne dites pas à nos amis que je vous ai écrit moi-même», recommanda-t-il: «Pour les autres en effet je dicte.» Les nouvelles qu'il lui donnait étaient bien découragées: «Je ne remonte pas la pente, hélas, je la descends au galop, mais je veux encore prolonger l'essai. Naturellement ne dites pas au docteur Sollier que je ne suis pas content! Car lui est char-

diatement antérieure à l'entrée de Proust à la clinique du Dr Sollier, où il est déjà en traitement le 6 décembre. Postérieure de peu à la lettre XX à Mme de Noailles. Cf. ci-dessous n. 49.

⁴⁸ Cf. A. Mme Straus, XXVII, [Peu après Vendredi 15 juin 1906]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 44.

⁴⁹ A. Mlle Nordlinger, billet non signé, d'une main étrangère, daté 6 décembre 1905, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 123.

⁵⁰ A. Louisa de Mornand, XL, [Vers Mercredi 6 décembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, V, 195. Non datée par l'éditeur. Immédiatement postérieure à l'entrée de Proust à la clinique, et vraisemblablement à peu près contemporaine du billet du 6 décembre à Mlle Nordlinger.

mant.⁵¹ Peut-être avait-il obtenu de ce charmant docteur trop de concessions pour que la cure fût efficace: un mois et demi de traitement au lieu des trois qu'exigeait Déjérine, et le droit de recevoir des visites au lieu de l'isolement total; mais surtout il n'était point de psychiatre qui le pût défendre contre l'obsession de ses souvenirs et l'incessante résurrection de son chagrin. «Moi qui ne croyais pas aux anniversaires», devait-il écrire quelques semaines plus tard à Mme de Noailles, «le jour de l'an a eu sur moi une puissance d'évocation terrible. Il m'a tout d'un coup rendu les mémoires de maman que j'avais perdues, le mémoire de sa voix.»⁵² Intermittence du souvenir, qui, en lui restituant soudain cette voix oubliée, lui fit éprouver dans toute son âpreté la souffrance dont il avait eu autrefois le sentiment en entendant au téléphone cette voix encore vivante: «Bien souvent», devait-il écrire plus tard, «l'écouter de la sorte, sans voir celle qui me parlait de si loin, il m'a semblé que cette voix clamait des profondeurs d'où l'on ne remonte pas, et j'ai connu l'anxiété qui m'étreindrait un jour, quand une voix reviendrait ainsi, seule et ne tenant plus à un corps que je ne devrais jamais revoir, murmurer à mon oreille des paroles que j'aurais voulu pouvoir embrasser au passage sur des lèvres à jamais en poussière.»⁵³

Vers la fin de janvier 1906, il quittait la clinique, en piteux état: «Il en est revenu

tellement souffrant», écrivit alors Louis d'Albuféra à Robert de Billy, «qu'il lui est impossible de vous répondre lui-même en ce moment et de vous dire combien vos lettres si affectueuses l'ont profondément touché.»⁵⁴ Il confia lui-même peu après à Mme de Noailles sur le ton le plus pessimiste: «Je suis rentré chez moi, mais si souffrant! Je n'ai pu me lever depuis que je suis revenu. Je commence à croire que je ne pourrai plus jamais aller vous voir, et j'aurais presque mieux aimé alors ne vous connaître jamais.»⁵⁵ A une affectueuse lettre de Robert de Billy il répondit que, si quelque chose pouvait lui faire de la peine en sentant sa santé à jamais ruinée et sa vie extrêmement limitée à un avenir qu'il n'imaginait pas lointain, ce serait la pensée qu'il lui faudrait quitter des amis comme lui, et en attendant être privé de leur compagnie: «Mais», ajoutait-il, «c'est une si grande joie pour moi de penser que maman a pu garder des illusions sur mon avenir que je ne peux vraiment pas avoir de tristesse à en faire le sacrifice maintenant que cela ne touche plus véritablement personne.»⁵⁶

Cependant, par piété sans doute envers cette mémoire sacrée, Marcel Proust reprit les travaux ruskiniens que sa mère favorisait. Dans la *Chronique des arts* de mai 1906 il rendit longuement compte des *Pierres de Venise* traduites par Mme Crémieux,⁵⁷ et surtout il mit la dernière main à sa propre traduction de *Sésame et les Lys*, qui parut enfin vers le 1^{er} juin,⁵⁸

⁵¹ A R. de Billy, XXX, [Vers fin décembre 1905-début janvier 1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, p. 164. Non datée par l'éditeur. Vraisemblablement postérieure de quelque temps à l'entrée de Proust à la clinique vers les tout premiers jours de décembre 1905, puisque, malgré l'aggravation de son état, il veut encore «prolonger l'essai». Nécessairement antérieure au départ de Billy, le Mardi 9 janvier 1906 au plus tard, pour la conférence d'Algésiras: cf. *Figaro*, Dimanche 7 et Jeudi 11 janvier 1906.

⁵² A Mme de Noailles, XXIX, [Vers fin janvier-début février 1906]*, *Correspondance*, II, 150. Datée (1906) par l'éditeur. Postérieure de peu au retour de Proust à la maison vers la fin de janvier 1906.

⁵³ «Journées de lectures», *Figaro*, Mercredi 20 mars 1907, p. 1; *Chroniques* (Paris: Gallimard, 1927), p. 86.

⁵⁴ L. d'Albuféra à R. de Billy, 27 janvier [1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, p. 160.

⁵⁵ A Mme de Noailles, XXIX, [Vers fin janvier-début février 1906]*, *Correspondance*, II, 151.

⁵⁶ A R. de Billy, XXVIII, [Vers février 1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, pp. 161-62. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure au retour de Proust à la maison vers la fin de janvier 1906. Antérieure à la clôture de la conférence d'Algésiras le 7 avril 1906.

⁵⁷ Cf. «John Ruskin.—*Les Pierres de Venise*. Trad. par Mme Mathilde P. Crémieux. Préface de M. Robert de la Sizeranne. Paris, Laurens. In-8°, 322 p. avec 24 pl.», *Chronique des arts*, 5 mai 1906, pp. 146-47.

⁵⁸ Annoncée le Samedi 2 juin 1906 dans la *Bibliographie de la France*, Feuilleton, pp. 1254-55, comme

précédée de la curieuse préface «Sur la lecture» et enrichie de notes abondantes. *Sésame et les Lys* devait être la dernière de ses publications ruskiniennes: aux amis qui le félicitèrent il exprima sa lassitude de ce vain travail de traduction et d'annotation, et il laissa entrevoir son désir d'entreprendre, dès que sa triste santé le lui permettrait, une œuvre originale.⁵⁹

C'est peut-être aussi par piété filiale qu'il songe à aller passer le mois d'août sur la côte normande, où il avait autrefois séjourné en compagnie de sa mère, comme il se propose de refaire en septembre «le calvaire d'Evian». Mais il hésite entre plusieurs projets: il se décidera peut-être à louer une propriété près de Cabourg, avec des amis très bons pour lui; il a aussi pensé à louer un petit bateau avec lequel il visiterait la Normandie et la Bretagne; il songe enfin à aller à Trouville même, avec sa vieille bonne, et à louer un chalet, ou un appartement à l'Hôtel des Roches Noires. Et de combien de contingences ne dépend pas la réalisation de tel ou tel de ces projets! Pour la propriété voisine de Cabourg, dès qu'il en saura le nom, Marcel priera Jacques Bizet ou Robert Dreyfus de s'informer auprès d'un agent de location de Trouville. Pour le bateau, c'est Robert de Billy qu'il a chargé de s'enquérir; mais, en attendant, il craint qu'à des prix possibles on n'ait que des yachts trop inconfortables et très périlleux; oui, le bateau serait charmant, mais à voiles il serait bien froid, et à vapeur il sentirait bien la fumée. Quant à Trouville même, les brumes de la vallée le soir lui sont mauvaises, et l'air de la mer un peu agitant; le chalet d'Harcourt est bien isolé et peut-être trop légèrement construit pour qu'on n'y sente pas le vent et

les courants d'air; et à l'Hôtel des Roches Noires il doit y avoir bien du bruit, les murs sont si minces qu'on entend tout, les cheminées ne sont probablement pas faites pour être allumées, et il ne pourrait pas faire chauffer son linge. Toutes ces complications, Marcel les explique à la fin de juillet à Mme Straus en une lettre interminable et filandreuse. En somme, s'il trouvait—c'est-à-dire si Mme Straus lui trouvait—«quelque chose de bien construit, de pas humide comme immeuble, de pas poussiéreux, genre moderne et nu, pas étouffé derrière des maisons, mais soit sur la plage, soit sur la hauteur, et ne dépassant pas 1000 francs pour le mois d'août», il le prendrait peut-être. Peut-être: car peut-être aussi, se hâte-t-il d'ajouter, au lieu d'attendre septembre pour aller à Evian ira-t-il dès août; à moins toutefois que, ayant découvert à Trouville un logis parfait, il ne décide d'y passer aussi septembre; mais il croit cependant qu'Evian serait plus raisonnable.⁶⁰

Ces velléités, ces hésitations, ces repentirs remplissent encore plusieurs autres lettres. Une circonstance nouvelle vint d'ailleurs bientôt mettre le comble à l'embarras de Marcel: Georges-Denis Weil, son oncle maternel, le propre frère de sa mère, tomba sérieusement malade. «L'état assez grave de mon oncle Weil», écrivit-il alors à Mme Straus, «et ma propre incertitude, m'empêchent d'avoir encore décidé quelque chose.» Mais comme il pouvait prendre d'un jour à l'autre, presque d'une heure à l'autre, une résolution immédiate, il n'en priait pas moins son amie de demander à Jacques

venant de paraître; annoncée le Jeudi 7 juin dans le *Mémorial de la librairie*, p. 285, parmi les nouveautés de la semaine.

⁵⁹ Cf. notre «Genèse de *Swann*», *Revue d'histoire de la philosophie et d'histoire générale de la civilisation*, 15 janvier 1937, pp. 75-76.

⁶⁰ Cf. A. Mme Straus, XXIX, [Samedi soir 21 juillet 1906]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 47-52. Datée [Vers juillet 1906] par l'éditeur. La date exacte se déduit des allusions au discours prononcé par un commandant de corps d'armée (cf. *Débats*, Samedi 21 juillet 1906) et à la prise d'armes à l'Ecole militaire pour la décoration de Dreyfus (cf. *Débats*, Dimanche 22 juillet 1906). Sur le projet de croisière, cf. aussi lettre XIX à R. de Billy, [Versailles, peu avant Jeudi 23 août 1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, pp. 144-46.

de poursuivre ses recherches; il reconnaissait d'ailleurs sans vergogne: «Je ne suis malheureusement pas mon maître et il est possible que je n'aie pas à Trouville, mais il est possible que j'y parte d'un moment à l'autre.»⁶¹ Quelques jours plus tard, il avait cédé à son inertie naturelle, mais il était exténué de ses velléités d'action: «Maintenant j'ai renoncé. Peut-être reprendrai-je mon projet, mais maintenant il faut me reposer de la fatigue du voyage, du voyage aussi épuisant à faire ainsi en projet près d'aboutir: depuis trois jours je me sentais en route et tout autour de moi avait déjà l'air des choses quittées. J'y rentre, assez douloureusement.»⁶²

Ce n'était point encore une résolution définitive. Un beau jour, au début d'août, toujours partagé entre son désir de partir et sa crainte de s'éloigner, il choisit brusquement un moyen terme et alla s'installer à Versailles, à l'Hôtel des Réservoirs. Il y occupa un appartement immense et admirable, un appartement genre historique, abominablement cher, mais triste, noir et glacé, avec des tableaux, des tentures et des psychés. Jamais le soleil n'y pénétrait; et quand on y allumait du feu dans une cheminée, toutes les autres se mettaient à fumer avec une telle violence que l'appartement n'était plus qu'un nuage. Le pauvre Marcel n'avait pas même la ressource d'en changer, car à peine y était-il arrivé qu'il était tombé malade;⁶³ en fait, il y devait rester cloîtré près de cinq mois. Entre temps, Georges-Denis Weil mourait, le 23 août, à

l'âge de cinquante-huit ans; les obsèques furent célébrées le 26, selon le rite israélite: on se réunit à la maison mortuaire, 22 place Malesherbes, et l'inhumation eut lieu au cimetière du Père-Lachaise. Marcel l'aimait beaucoup, ce pauvre oncle Weil qui, à Paris, venait si fidèlement le voir tous les soirs: mais, incapable de sortir, incapable même de se lever, il ne put aller à son enterrement. Depuis bien des mois, d'ailleurs, il ne lui avait pas été possible une seule fois de se lever et de s'habiller; mais, tout en se considérant comme incurable, il ne renonçait pas tout à fait à l'espoir d'améliorer assez sa santé pour voir quelquefois ses amis: «Je ne puis plus guérir», écrivit-il peu après les obsèques à Laure Hayman, «mais j'espère arriver progressivement, tout autre moyen est impossible et ne m'a donné que les plus mauvais résultats, à reprendre une vie non pas normale, mais qui n'exclue pas au même point les plaisirs les plus simples de société.»⁶⁴

De nouveaux tourments se préparaient pour lui avec l'approche de l'automne. Dès novembre 1905, il s'était rendu compte qu'il lui faudrait abandonner l'appartement de la rue de Courcelles, devenu trop grand et trop cher pour lui seul, et il avait écrit à Mme de Noailles: «Dire qu'il faudra quitter ces lieux qui ne sont si tristes que parce qu'ils ont été si heureux, et qui font partie de mon cœur.»⁶⁵ Au début de septembre 1906, il commença donc à faire chercher un appartement pour le terme d'octobre: et ses hésitations, ses anxiétés, ses locations commencées, puis rompues au moment de signer le bail,

⁶¹ A Mme Straus, XXX, [29 (?) juillet 1906], *Correspondance*, VI, 52-53. Datée sans explication par l'éditeur.

⁶² A Mme Straus, XXXIII, [Début août 1906], *Correspondance*, VI, 59. Datée sans explication par l'éditeur.

⁶³ Cf. A Mme Straus, XXXIV, [Versailles, peu avant Jeudi 23 août 1906]*, *Correspondance*, pp. 60-62. Datée [Versailles, vers août 1906] par l'éditeur. Postérieure de quelques jours au départ de Proust pour Versailles, annoncé le Mardi 14 août 1906 dans le *Figaro*. Antérieure à la mort de Georges-Denis Weil, survenue le Jeudi 23 août 1906: cf. *Temps* et *Figaro*, Samedi 25 août 1906.

⁶⁴ A Laure Hayman, VIII, [Versailles, peu après Dimanche 26 août 1906]*, *Correspondance*, V, 216-18. Non datée par l'éditeur. La date se déduit de l'allusion à «l'enterrement de mon pauvre oncle l'autre jour». Cf. aussi lettre L à R. de Billy, [Versailles, peu après Dimanche 26 août 1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, pp. 210-11. Non datée par l'éditeur. Evidemment contemporaine de la lettre VIII à Laure Hayman.

⁶⁵ A Mme de Noailles, XX, [Vers fin novembre 1905]*, *Correspondance*, II, 108.

devinrent une telle obsession qu'il en perdit le sommeil. Enfin il prit sa décision : forcé de s'arracher de l'appartement qui était pour lui «le vrai et cher cimetière», il n'eut pas le courage d'aller loger dans une maison que sa mère n'aurait pas connue, dans un appartement où il aurait senti que les yeux de sa mère ne l'avaient jamais vu. Il arrêta donc son choix sur un appartement de l'immeuble du boulevard Haussmann dont il était propriétaire avec son frère et sa tante : l'appartement même qu'avait naguère habité son oncle Louis Weil, où il était souvent venu dîner avec sa mère et où ils avaient vu ensemble mourir le vieillard. C'était un appartement fort laid, entre le Printemps et Saint-Augustin, dans la poussière et le bruit du boulevard, dont les marronniers poussaient leurs branches jusque sous les fenêtres ; il était en outre trop cher pour que Marcel pût songer à s'y installer définitivement ; mais pour cette année la locataire qui le payait sans l'habiter consentait à le sous-louer pour un prix raisonnable ; et il servirait ainsi de transition entre le cher passé et l'inconnu.⁶⁶

L'appartement arrêté, les tribulations du nouveau locataire étaient loin d'être finies. Il restait à emménager ; mais l'ancienne locataire, qui s'était engagée à faire terminer les réparations pour le terme d'octobre, ne tint pas sa parole, et Marcel Proust parla de lui intenter un procès.⁶⁷ Enfin les travaux furent terminés vers le

milieu de novembre, et Marcel allait emménager, quand un nouvel obstacle surgit : son frère et sa tante eurent l'idée, que pour sa part il trouva singulière, de louer l'étage au-dessus du sien, et à un locataire qui allait y entreprendre de longues et bruyantes réparations : il lui était impossible de s'exposer à ce tintamarre, et il se voyait donc forcé de rester indéfiniment à geler et à dépenser de l'argent à Versailles. A vrai dire, il aurait pu s'opposer ouvertement à cette location comme illégale, puisque la maison devait être louée «bourgeoisement» et que le nouveau locataire était un médecin. Mais, comme on avait négligé d'obtenir l'assentiment d'un des autres locataires, lequel était homme à intenter un procès, Proust, préférant ce moyen plus discret d'arriver à ses fins, insista astucieusement pour que l'on prévînt le grincheux, avec qui d'ailleurs il était lié. Il envoya lui-même plus de trente dépêches, il fit faire plus de cinquante téléphonages, mais en vain : «Enfin», écrivit-il à Mme Straus vers la fin de novembre, «je pense que cette location sera signée d'un jour à l'autre, que les catastrophes ne tarderont pas, et ainsi je n'aurai plus la fatigue de l'agitation, qui se répercute sur le sommeil, de là sur l'asthme ; c'est un bonheur d'habiter une maison à soi !»⁶⁸

En attendant, il lui fallait continuer à vivre cloîtré dans son sinistre appartement de l'Hôtel des Réservoirs. «Je suis à Versailles depuis quatre mois», écrivait-il au début de décembre à Mme Gaston de Caillavet, «mais est-ce bien Versailles ? Je n'ai pas quitté mon lit, je n'ai pas pu une seule fois aller au Château, ni à

⁶⁶ Cf. A Mme Straus, XXXV [Versailles, 10 octobre 1906], *Correspondance*, VI, 62-63. Datée par l'éditeur d'après le cachet postal. Cependant, si l'on admet pour le «déplacement» de Proust à Versailles la date indiquée par le *Figaro* ou même une date antérieure de quelques jours, il faudrait avancer d'une quinzaine environ la date de la lettre en question, puisque Proust y déclare qu'il vit à Versailles «depuis deux mois et demi».

⁶⁷ Cf. A Bertrand de Fénélon, I, [Versailles, vers fin octobre 1906]*, *Correspondance*, IV, 146. Non datée par l'éditeur. Postérieure à la location de l'appartement du boulevard Haussmann, annoncée dans la lettre XXXV à Mme Straus ; postérieure de quelque temps au 15 octobre, date du terme, à laquelle les travaux de réfection entrepris par le locataire sortant auraient dû être achevés.

⁶⁸ Cf. A Mme Straus, XXXVII, [Versailles, vers seconde quinzaine de novembre 1906]*, *Correspondance*, VI, 64-68. Datée [Versailles, fin 1906] par l'éditeur. Postérieure de quelque temps à la formation du ministère Clémenceau, annoncée le 24 octobre 1906 dans le *Figaro* ; postérieure d'au moins trois mois à l'arrivée de Proust à Versailles. Approximativement contemporaine de la lettre XXI à R. de Billy, *Lettres et conversations*, pp. 149-52, que nous datons [Versailles, vers fin novembre 1906]* : cf. ci-dessous n. 71.

Trianon, ni nulle part; j'ouvre les yeux à la nuit close, et je me demande souvent si le lieu hermétiquement clos et éclairé à l'électricité où je suis est, plutôt situé qu'ailleurs, à Versailles, dont je n'ai pas vu une seule feuille morte tourbillonner au-dessus d'aucune de ses pièces d'eau. Telle est ma belle jeunesse et ma belle vie.⁶⁹ Intellectuellement, il était inerte: certes, il lisait assidument le *Figaro* et les *Débats*: mais il avait définitivement abandonné Ruskin; et il se sentait incapable de remettre sur le métier la grande œuvre qu'il rêvait une dizaine d'années auparavant et dont il avait introduit dans son article «Sur la lecture» quelques fragments exhumés de ses tiroirs: «Travaillez-vous?», demande-t-il à Marie Nordlinger, «moi, plus. J'ai clos à jamais l'ère des traductions, que maman favorisait. Et quant aux traductions de moi-même, je n'en ai plus le courage.»⁷⁰

Mais sa lassitude et sa claustration n'étaient point un obstacle à sa philanthropie. Vers la fin de novembre, il avait écrit à Robert de Billy qu'il désirait trouver une place à «un jeune homme de vingt-cinq ans, très distingué et bien d'aspect, écrivant bien, assez bon pour la comptabilité, très gentilles manières, très sérieux, mais sans instruction plus approfondie». Peut-être le beau-père de Robert de Billy, M. Mirabaud, aurait-il quelque chose pour lui dans sa maison de banque: «Je voudrais», expliquait-il à son ami, «qu'il gagnât de 100 à 200 francs par mois. A la rigueur il s'expatrierait si c'était pour une chose d'avenir. Pouvez-vous demander cela à votre beau-père sans que cela vous ennuie?»⁷¹ Quelques

semaines plus tard, il s'occupait d'un autre protégé: il demandait à un certain Henri van Blarenberghe, qu'il connaissait un peu et dont le père était, de son vivant, président du Conseil d'administration de la Compagnie des Chemins de fer de l'Est, des renseignements sur un des employés de cette compagnie, auquel «un de [ses] amis», paraît-il, «s'intéressait» — probablement de la même façon que M. de Charlus s'intéresserait plus tard à un contrôleur d'omnibus. Vaine démarche: le 12 janvier 1907 Henri van Blarenberghe répondait: «Je me suis informé à la Compagnie de l'Est de la présence possible dans le personnel de X... et de son adresse éventuelle. On n'a rien découvert. Si vous êtes bien sûr du nom, celui qui le porte a disparu de la Compagnie sans laisser de traces; il ne devait y être attaché que d'une manière bien provisoire et accessoire.»⁷²

Lorsqu'il reçut, le 17 janvier 1907, cette réponse qui lui enlevait tout espoir de faire plus ample connaissance avec le mystérieux employé des Chemins de fer de l'Est, Marcel Proust était, depuis près de trois semaines déjà, installé dans son nouvel appartement du 102 Boulevard Haussmann.⁷³ Quelques jours plus tard, le vendredi 25, il se rappela en s'éveillant qu'il devait répondre à cette lettre; mais, avant d'entreprendre cette tâche, il vou-

par l'éditeur. Postérieure d'un mois environ à la constitution du ministère Clémenceau, annoncée le 24 octobre 1906 dans le *Figaro*: allusion aux «antidreyfusards qui sont bruyamment devenus dreyfusards il y a un mois.» Antérieure à la discussion du projet de loi portant ratification de l'Acte d'Algésiras, annoncée le Jeudi 29 novembre 1906 pour le Jeudi 6 décembre: cf. *Figaro*, Vendredi 30 novembre 1906. L'Acte d'Algésiras fut effectivement ratifié par la Chambre le Jeudi 6 décembre: cf. *Figaro*, Vendredi 7 décembre 1906.

⁷² Cf. Henri van Blarenberghe à Marcel Proust, 12 janvier 1907, lettre citée par Marcel Proust, «Sentiments filiaux d'un parricide», *Figaro*, Vendredi 1^{er} février 1907, p. 1; *Pastiches et Mélanges* (Paris: Gallimard, 1919), pp. 215-16.

⁷³ C'est en effet le 27 décembre 1906 qu'il avait emménagé: cf. à Mme Straus, XXXVIII, [Vers mars 1907], *Correspondance*, VI, 71.

⁶⁹ A Mme Gaston de Caillavet, II, [Versailles, Samedi 8 décembre 1906]*, *Correspondance*, IV, 112. Non datée par l'éditeur. Ecrite le lendemain de l'annonce, parue le Vendredi 7 décembre 1906 dans le *Figaro*, que Robert de Flers a écrit un avant-propos pour la matinée Paulus.

⁷⁰ A Mlle Nordlinger, XXXVIII, [Versailles, Samedi 8 décembre 1906], *Lettres à une amie*, p. 105.

⁷¹ A R. de Billy, XXI, [Versailles, vers fin novembre 1906]*, *Lettres et conversations*, p. 150. Non datée

lut d'abord jeter un regard sur le *Figaro*, «procéder à cet acte abominable et voluptueux qui s'appelle lire le journal et grâce auquel tous les malheurs et les cataclysmes de l'univers pendant les dernières vingt-quatre heures, ... transmués pour notre usage personnel à nous qui n'y sommes pas intéressés en un régal matinal, s'associent excellemment d'une façon particulièrement excitante et tonique à l'ingestion recommandée de quelques gorgées de café au lait.» Il venait de parcourir d'un regard charmé les éruptions volcaniques, les crises ministérielles et les duels d'apaches, et il commençait avec calme la lecture d'un fait divers que son titre, «Un drame de la folie», pouvait rendre particulièrement propre à la vive stimulation des énergies matinales, quand tout d'un coup il vit que la victime, c'était Mme van Blarenberghe mère, et que l'assassin, qui s'était ensuite suicidé, c'était son fils Henri van Blarenberghe, celui-là même dont Marcel Proust gardait encore la lettre près de lui pour y répondre.⁷⁴

Le mercredi matin 30 janvier, Gaston Calmette, le directeur du *Figaro*, envoya un mot à Marcel Proust pour lui demander un article au sujet de ce drame; mais, à cause d'une crise d'asthme, Marcel ne put prendre connaissance de ce message avant 10 heures du soir. Il se reposa jusqu'à 2 heures du matin, sans penser à son article; à 3 heures il se leva et se mit aussitôt à écrire, sans même faire de brouillon, sur les feuilles mêmes qu'il allait envoyer au journal. A 8 heures, le jeudi matin, il n'avait pas encore fini, et, comme il avait trop mal à la main pour continuer, il se coucha en priant qu'on l'éveillât dans la journée; mais à 8 heures

et demie, des «travaux affreux» commencèrent dans l'appartement au-dessous du sien, et il en ressentit un tel malaise qu'il renonça à finir son article et l'envoya inachevé au *Figaro*, tel quel et sans l'avoir relu. A 11 heures du soir on lui apporta à corriger les épreuves, qu'il devait renvoyer à minuit. Il se mit donc à la tâche; mais il lui vint alors l'idée d'une fin qu'il jugea vraiment assez bonne. Comme le temps manquait pour tout faire, il renonça à corriger les épreuves et écrivit à la fin sa conclusion. A minuit il dépêcha le tout au *Figaro*, avec la permission de retrancher ce qu'on voudrait dans le corps de l'article et la défense expresse de changer un seul mot à la conclusion.

L'article parut le lendemain matin, vendredi 1^{er} février, en première page, sous le titre de «Sentiments filiaux d'un parricide». Contrairement aux instructions de l'auteur, on avait entièrement supprimé la fin, dont il ne restait pas un mot: Cardane, le secrétaire de la rédaction, y avait vu un éloge du parricide et l'avait condamnée comme immorale.⁷⁵ Proust du moins l'affirme, peut-être à tort: car aucune fin n'aurait pu, semble-t-il, être plus belle ni plus émouvante que le dernier paragraphe tel qu'il fut publié. Certes, le début de l'article est languissant: les relations mondaines des familles Proust et Blarenberghe laissent le lecteur indifférent; le récit de l'enquête sur l'emploi des Chemins de fer de l'Est semble surtout destiné à atteindre par la voie du *Figaro* un personnage singulièrement soucieux de garder l'incognito; et les considérations sur la lecture du journal trahissent une préciosité un peu déplacée en l'occurrence. Mais, avec le récit du drame même, le ton change tout à coup, pour prendre une gravité et une profondeur tragiques. Les souvenirs évoqués, ce sont ceux de la fureur d'Ajazz, de l'expiation d'Edipe, du désespoir de Lear: c'est

⁷⁴ Cf. Jean de Paris, «Un drame de la folie», *Figaro*, Vendredi 25 janvier 1907, p. 3; et Marcel Proust, «Sentiments filiaux d'un parricide», *ibid.*, Vendredi 1^{er} février 1907, p. 1. Nous avons vainement cherché «les éruptions volcaniques, les crises ministérielles et les duels d'apaches» que Proust prétend avoir trouvés ce jour-là dans le *Figaro*.

⁷⁵ Cf. A. R. Dreyfus, XXVIII, [Dimanche 3 février 1907], *Correspondance*, IV, 213-14.

que, dans ce criminel qui a assassiné sa mère et s'est ensuite fait justice, Marcel Proust veut nous faire reconnaître une victime de l'antique fatalité. «J'ai voulu montrer», explique-t-il, «dans quelle pure, dans quelle religieuse atmosphère de beauté morale eut lieu cette explosion de folie et de sang qui l'éclabousse sans parvenir à la souiller. J'ai voulu aérer la chambre du crime d'un souffle qui vînt du ciel, montrer que ce fait divers était exactement un de ces drames grecs dont la représentation était presque une cérémonie religieuse, et que le pauvre parricide n'était pas une brute criminelle, un être en dehors de l'humanité, mais un noble exemplaire d'humanité, un homme d'esprit éclairé, un fils tendre et pieux, que la plus inéluctable fatalité—disons pathologique pour parler comme tout le monde—a jeté—le plus malheureux des mortels—dans un crime et une expiation dignes de demeurer illustres.»⁷⁶

Mais, s'il s'efforce si éloquentement de nous montrer dans ce criminel qui a égorgé sa mère une victime innocente de la fatalité tragique, c'est que Marcel Proust se reconnaît en lui comme en un miroir; c'est que, dans l'horreur de cet assassinat physique, il retrouve toute l'horreur de l'assassinat moral qu'il a commis sur sa propre mère. Les remords qui, durant plus d'une année, n'ont cessé de le tourmenter, il ne peut plus maintenant les exorciser: pour échapper un moment à l'affreuse conscience de sa culpabilité, il n'est plus pour le petit Marcel d'autre ressource que l'aveu; et, irrésistiblement, dans le dernier paragraphe, l'aveu jaillit, épouvantable. «Henri, qu'as-tu fait de moi! qu'as-tu fait de moi!» s'était écriée Mme van Blarenberghe mourante. «Qu'as-tu fait de moi! qu'as-tu fait de moi!» reprend Marcel Proust. «Si nous voulions y penser, il n'y a peut-être pas une mère

vraiment aimante qui ne pourrait, à son dernier jour, souvent bien avant, adresser ce reproche à son fils. Au fond, nous vieillissons, nous tuons tout ce qui nous aime par les soucis que nous lui donnons, par l'inquiète tendresse elle-même que nous inspirons et mettons sans cesse en alarme. Si nous pouvions voir dans un corps chéri le lent travail de destruction poursuivi par la douloureuse tendresse qui l'anime, si nous savions voir les yeux flétris, les cheveux, longtemps restés indomptablement noirs, ensuite vaincus comme le reste et blanchissants, les artères amollies, les reins bouchés, le cœur forcé, vaincu le courage devant la vie, la marche alentie, alourdi l'esprit qui sait qu'il n'a plus à espérer, alors qu'il rebondissait si inlassablement en invincibles espérances, la gaieté même, la gaieté innée et semblait-il immortelle qui faisait si aimable compagnie avec la tristesse, à jamais tarie, peut-être celui qui saurait voir cela, dans ce moment tardif de lucidité que les vies les plus ensorcelées de chimère peuvent bien avoir, puisque celle même de don Quichotte eut le sien, peut-être celui-là, comme Henri van Blarenberghe quand il eut achevé sa mère à coups de poignard, reculerait devant l'horreur de sa vie et se jetterait sur un poignard, sur un fusil, pour mourir tout de suite.»⁷⁷

La confession ne pouvait être plus complète, ni plus publique. Elle devait marquer, vers l'expiation et la rédemption, le premier effort d'une âme convaincue et désespérée de son ignominie, mais encore enlisée dans sa lâcheté et encore destinée à bien des défaillances; et elle apporta bientôt quelque soulagement à ce cœur bourrelé de contrition. Moins de trois semaines plus tard, à Georges de Lauris dont la mère venait de mourir, Marcel

⁷⁶ «Sentiments filiaux d'un parricide», *Figaro*, Vendredi 1^{er} février 1907, p. 1; *Pastiches et Mélanges*, p. 221.

⁷⁷ *Figaro*, Vendredi 1^{er} février 1907, p. 1; *Pastiches et Mélanges*, pp. 223-24: Nous citons le texte du *Figaro*, dont celui des *Pastiches et Mélanges* diffère sur plusieurs points.

Proust pouvait promettre, après l'atroce déchirement, de prochaines douceurs: «Quand vous aviez votre mère», lui écrivait-il le soir même des obsèques, «vous pensiez beaucoup aux jours de maintenant où vous ne l'auriez plus. Maintenant vous pensez beaucoup aux jours d'autrefois où vous l'aviez. Quand vous vous serez habitué à cette chose affreuse que c'est d'être à jamais rejeté dans l'autrefois, alors vous la sentirez tout doucement revivre, revenir prendre sa place, toute sa place, auprès de vous.» Il l'admettait, ce réconfort n'était pas encore permis à son ami; mais il l'engageait à être inerte, à attendre que la force incompréhensible qui l'avait brisé le relevât un peu: «Je dis un peu», expliquait-il, «parce que vous garderez toujours quelque chose de brisé. Dites-vous cela aussi, car c'est une douceur de savoir qu'on n'aimera jamais moins, qu'on ne se consolera jamais, qu'on se souviendra de plus en plus.»⁷⁸ Cinq mois après cette effusion d'une douleur déjà moins amère et comme rassérée par quelque secrète absolution, il reprenait son rôle de consolateur avec plus d'assurance encore, auprès de Robert de Flers qui venait de perdre l'admirable grand-mère qui lui avait tenu lieu de mère.⁷⁹ En évoquant la perpétuelle inquiétude et le dévouement inlassable de Mme de Rozière pour son petit-fils, en s'écriant que la mort devait être bien forte pour avoir pu les séparer, en refusant de tenir cette séparation pour éternelle, c'est à sa propre mère qu'il pense autant qu'à la grand-mère de son ami: «Comment! deux êtres si entièrement correspondants que rien n'existait dans l'un qui ne trouvât dans l'autre sa raison d'être, son but, sa satisfaction, son explication,

son tendre commentaire, deux êtres qui semblaient la traduction l'un de l'autre, bien que chacun d'eux fût un original, ces deux êtres n'auraient fait que se rencontrer un instant, par hasard, dans l'infini des temps, où ils ne seront plus rien l'un à l'autre, rien de plus particulier qu'ils ne sont à des milliards d'autres êtres? Faut-il vraiment le penser?»⁸⁰ Pour sa part, il ne pourra, dit-il, jamais le croire tout à fait. Il ose maintenant affirmer qu'on ne dit jamais vraiment adieu aux êtres qu'on a aimés, parce qu'on ne les quitte jamais tout à fait; et que rien ne dure, pas même la mort. Comme naguère au chevet de sa mère morte, il sourit à travers ses larmes: mais à l'âme immortelle et non plus à la dépouille terrestre, car il a maintenant appris à croire, pour l'éprouver sans cesse, à la mystique communion des vivants et des morts: «Les êtres qu'on a le plus aimés, on ne pense jamais à eux, au moment où l'on pleure le plus, sans leur adresser passionnément le plus tendre sourire dont on soit capable. Est-ce pour essayer de les tromper, de les rassurer, de leur dire qu'ils peuvent être tranquilles, que nous aurons du courage, pour leur faire croire que nous ne sommes pas malheureux? Est-ce, plutôt, que ce sourire-là n'est que la forme même de l'interminable baiser que nous leur donnons dans l'Invisible?»⁸¹

Moins de deux ans après, lorsque, réalisant enfin sa vocation littéraire, il concevra l'idée de sa *Recherche du temps perdu*, elle aussi mêlée de sourires et de larmes, c'est encore un message de tendresse en même temps qu'une offrande expiatoire que Marcel Proust commencera d'adresser à sa mère dans l'Invisible.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

⁷⁸ A G. de Lauris, IV, [Lundi soir 18 février 1907]*, *Revue de Paris*, 15 juin 1938, pp. 761-62. Datée février 1907 par l'éditeur. La date exacte se déduit de l'allusion aux obsèques de la marquise de Lauris, célébrées le matin même: cf. *Figaro*, Lundi 18 février 1907.

⁷⁹ Cf. «Une grand-mère», *Figaro*, Mardi 23 juillet 1907, p. 2; *Chroniques*, pp. 67-72.

⁸⁰ *Figaro*, Mardi 23 juillet 1907, p. 2; *Chroniques*, pp. 67-71. Le même thème sera repris, en termes presque identiques, à propos de la grand-mère du protagoniste, dans *Sodome et Gomorrhe*, II*, 179-80.

⁸¹ *Figaro*, Mardi 23 juillet 1907, p. 2; *Chroniques*, pp. 71-72.

VICTORIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1944

Edited by WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN

THIS bibliography has been prepared by a committee of the Victorian Literature Group of the Modern Language Association of America: William D. Templeman, chairman, University of Illinois; Charles Frederick Harold, Ohio State University; Austin Wright, Carnegie Institute of Technology; and William Irvine, Stanford University. It attempts to list the noteworthy publications of 1944 (including reviews of these and earlier items) that have a bearing on English literature of the Victorian period and similar publications of earlier date that have been inadvertently omitted from the preceding Victorian bibliography. Unless otherwise stated, the date of publication is 1944. Reference to a page in the bibliography for 1943, in *Modern philology*, May, 1944, is made by the following form: See VB 1943, 255. Some cross-references are given, although not all that are possible. For certain continuing bibliographical works, and for most of the abbreviations used, see the preceding Victorian bibliographies.

KEY TO NEW ABBREVIATIONS

AB = *Amer. bookman* *KR* = *Kenyon review*
Ex = *Explicator* *ParR* = *Partisan review*

I. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

"American bibliography for 1943." *PMLA*, LVIII, Suppl., 1231-42: English, "Nineteenth century," and "Contemporary," ed. Albert C. Baugh and others.

The Association of Research Libraries (comps.). *A catalog of books represented by Library of Congress printed cards*. . . . Vols. LXVII-CX (HERED-OGDEN). See VB 1943, 241.

Bond, Donald F. "Anglo-French and Franco-American studies: a current bibliography" (for 1943). *RoR*, XXXV, 186-202.

Brightfield. See **Lockhart**: Brightfield.

C[hristy], A. E. "Report on the *Guide to comparative literature and intercultural relations*." *Comparative literature news-letter*, III, No. 1 (Oct. 15), 1-10.

Church, Richard. *British authors: a 20th century gallery*. London: Longmans, Green. Pp. 155+58 portraits.

Rev. in *TLS*, Aug. 26, p. 419.

Fucilla, Joseph G. "Petrarchan translations in British periodicals." *BBDI*, XVIII, 39-40.

Includes a few early Victorians.

Gohdes. See III, Gohdes.

Graham, Walter (ed.). "The Romantic movement: a selective and critical bibliography for the year 1943." *ELH*, XI, 1-37.

Henkin, Leo J. "Problems and digressions in the Victorian novel." *BBDI*, XVIII, 40-43, 56-60, 83-86.

First three articles in a series of subject bibliographies, compiled from reviews published in periodicals 1860-1900 (esp. the *Athenaeum* and the *Saturday review*). Thus far only "Religion" has been treated—under the headings "Religious doubt and disbelief," "Ritualism or high church," "Protestantism vs. Catholicism," "Nonconformity or dissent," "Evangelical or low church."

Jaryc. See III, Jaryc.

La Drière, Craig. "Annotated bibliography: recent publications related to literary theory and criticism." *AB*, I (winter), 100-126; (fall), 74-121.

Lewis, C. L. See III, Lewis.

Ewing, Majl. "Notes on Nicoll's hand-list for 1800-1850." *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 460-64.

Mammen, Edward W. See III, Mammen.

Northup, C. S., and Parry, John J. "The Arthurian legends: modern retellings of the old stories: an annotated bibliography." *JEGP*, XLIII, 173-221.

Many valuable items in Bulwer-Lytton, Hewlett, Morris, Swinburne, Tennyson, etc. Starts with 1800, because that year roughly marks "the beginning of the modern attitude toward the material."

Oates. See III, Oates.

Pane, Remigio U. *English translations from the Spanish, 1484-1943: a bibliography*. ("Rutgers univ. studies in Spanish," No. 2.) Rutgers univ. pr. Pp. vi+218.

Rabinovitz, Albert C. (comp.). *New York University index to early American periodical literature, 1728-1870*, No. 5: *French fiction*. New York: William-Frederick pr., 1943. Pp. 46.

Rev. by R. Cohen in *RoR*, XXXV, 267-69. Many articles listed are reprinted from English periodicals. The compiler's work is in part based on the general *Index to early American periodical literature, 1728-1870*, "a file of over a million cards, now housed in the New York University Library, the compilation of which was begun as a WPA project in 1934."

Ratchford, Fannie E. (ed.). *Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn: a further inquiry into the guilt of certain nineteenth-century forgers*. New York: Knopf. Pp. xiv+591+xvi.

Rev. by R. C. Smith in *Publishers' weekly*, Dec. 23, pp. 2385-88.

Simmons. See III, Simmons.

Templeman, William D. (ed.). "Victorian bibliography for 1943." *MP*, XLI, 241-60.

Tobin, James Edward. "More English plays: 1800-1850." *PQ*, XXIII, 320-32.

Supplement to Nicoll, *A history of early nineteenth century drama*. . . . See also VB 1942, 330: Biella.

Troubridge, St. V. "Notes on XIX century drama, 1800-1850." *N & Q*, Oct. 21, p. 189.

On the book by Allardyce Nicoll.

The year's work in English studies, Vol. XXII (1941). Ed. for the English Assoc. by F. S.

Boas. Oxford univ. pr. "The nineteenth century and after," pp. 193-227; "Bibliographica," pp. 228-35.

II. ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, RELIGIOUS, AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Aldington, Richard. *The Duke*. . . . See VB 1943, 242.

Rev. by P. Knaplund in *PSQ*, LIX, 138-39; by J. Scammell in *AHR*, XLIX, 710-11; briefly in *Amer. mercury*, LVIII, 121; in *Dalhousie rev.*, XXIII, 485.

Baily, L. J. R. "The Royal West London theatre in the nineteenth century." *N & Q*, Oct. 21, pp. 182-84.

Barton, Margaret, and Sitwell, Sir Osbert. *Sober truth*. London: Macdonald. Pp. 235.

Collection of nineteenth-century episodes, fantastic, grotesque, and mysterious.

Berger, Max. *The British traveller in America, 1836-1860*. See VB 1943, 242.

Rev. by R. Beyer in *Mississippi Valley hist. rev.*, XXX, 577; by C. Thompson in *NEQ*, XVII, 127-28.

Birkenhead, Sheila Smith, Countess of. *Against oblivion*. New York: Macmillan; London: Cassell, 1943. Pp. ix+324; 244.

Biography of Joseph Severn. Rev. by C. Baker in *NYTBR*, June 25, p. 12; by B. Evans in *Book week*, July 2, p. 5; by L. Fowler in *S*, June 18, 1943, p. 572; by R. Humphries in *N*, July 29, p. 134; by P. Quennell in *NS*, July 24, 1943, p. 61; by E. Weeks in *Atl. month.*, CLXXIV, 125; by G. Whicher in *HTB*, June 25, p. 2; in *Amer. mercury*, LIX, 254; in *TLS*, May 29, 1943, p. 256.

Bolitho, Hector (ed.). *A Batsford century*. . . . See VB 1943, 242.

Rev. by P. McPharlin in *Publishers' weekly*, July 1, pp. 45-47; in *NR*, CCXXII, 261-62; in *QR*, CCLXXXII, 116.

Booth, J. B. *The days we knew*. London: Laurie. Pp. xvi+256.

Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 1, p. 8. Contains memories of the 1890's.

Burton, Jean. *Heyday of a wizard: Daniel Home, the medium*. New York: Knopf. Pp. 275+vi.

Home flourished in the mid-nineteenth century. Various writers, including the Brownings, were interested in him. Rev. by L. Bacon in *SRL*, May 6, p. 12; by C. Baker in *NYTBR*, Apr. 16, p. 4; by W. Johnson in *Book week*, Apr. 25, p. 5; by J. Krutch in *HTB*, Apr. 16, p. 4. See also VB 1937, 427, for biog. of Home by Wyndham.

Coulton, G. G. *Fourscore years: an autobiography*. New York: Macmillan. Pp. xiii+378.

Rev. by N. Annan in *NS*, Jan. 8, p. 28; by C. Boyd in *NYTBR*, June 11, p. 7; by C. Cadoux in *HJ*, XLII, 279; by S. C. Chew in *HTB*, June 11, p. 4; by J. Frederick in *Book week*, June 25, p. 2; by W. Harris in *S*, Dec. 10, 1943, p. 556; in *N & Q*, Jan. 29, p. 82; in *TLS*, Dec. 25, 1943, p. 613.

Cruikshank, George. *The bottle, in eight plates*. Critical and historical commentary by Finley Foster, in *The broadside*, No. 5. Cleveland: Published for the Associates of the Libraries of Western Reserve Univ.

Davies, Bernice F. "The social status of the middle-class Victorian woman as it is interpreted in representative mid-nineteenth century novels and periodicals." *Abstracts of dissertations, Stanford univ., 1942-43*, pp. 45-47.

Covers period 1845-85. Principal novelists: Dickens, Charlotte Brontë, Thackeray, Eliot, Collins, Trollope, Meredith. Principal periodicals: *Punch*, *Fraser's mag.*, *Westminster rev.*

Deland, Margaret. *Golden yesterdays*. New York: Harper, 1941. Pp. 351.

Economist, 1843-1943: a centenary volume. Oxford univ. pr., 1943. Pp. 182.

Reprint of the articles contained in the centenary number of the *Economist*, with some other items. Includes "Walter Bagehot," by Francis W. Hirst; "Bagehot and the trade cycle," by W. W. Rostow. Rev. by F. von Hayek in *Economica*, new ser., XI, 51.

Elbogen, Ismar. *A century of Jewish life*. Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc. of America. Pp. xliii+814.

Treats most of the world, esp. Europe; includes chap. on the Jews in the British Empire; annotated; has bibliog. on pp. 771-86.

Elwin, Malcolm. "Literature in North Devon." *QR*, CCLXXXII, 190-204.

Latter part devoted to Victorian writers as they were concerned with the region.

Gallatin, A. E. "Aubrey Beardsley." *TLS*, July 29, p. 367.

Green, Roger Lancelyn. "Burne-Jones and 'The fairy family.'" *TLS*, Aug. 26, p. 420.

Hammerton, Sir John. *Books and myself*. London: Macdonald. Pp. 343.

Harris, Wilson. *Caroline Fox*. London: Constable. Pp. 360.

Biography, based on journals of C. Fox (d. 1871), published in 1882. Rev. by F. Swinnerton in *S*, Dec. 1, p. 508.

Howe, Ellic. *Newspaper printing in the nineteenth century*. London: Privately printed, 1943. Pp. 43.

Rev. by A. F. J. in *Library*, 4th ser., XXIV, 205.

Howe, Ellic (ed.). *The trade: passages from the literature of the printing craft, 1550-1935*. London: Privately printed, Hutchinson Printing Trust, 1943. Pp. 151.

Rev. by A. F. J. in *Library*, 4th ser., XXIV, 204-5.

Hubbard, Hesketh. *Some Victorian draughtsmen*. Cambridge univ. pr. Pp. viii+48.

Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 13, 1945, p. 22.

Hutchinson, Walter (ed.). *The printer's devil: an account of the history and objects of the Printers' Pension . . . Corporation*. Comp. by John Creasey. London: Hutchinson, 1943. Pp. 95.

Rev. briefly in *Dickensian*, XL, 101.

Lieven. *The Lieven-Palmerston correspondence, 1828-1856*. See VB 1943, 244.

Rev. in *EHR*, LIX, 126-27.

Lunn, Arnold. "The religious prospect." *NC*, CXXXV, 133-37.

Includes many references to the warfare between science and religion in the Victorian period.

Martindale, Hilda. *From one generation to another, 1829-1944: a book of memoirs*. London: Allen & Unwin. Pp. 208.

Rev. in *TLS*, Aug. 19, p. 407. Includes Victorian reminiscences.

Micklewright, F. H. A. "Joseph Rayner Stephens, 1805-1879." *N & Q*, Jan. 1, pp. 8-12.

On the career of the Chartist leader.

Mineka, Francis E. *The dissidence of dissent: "The monthly repository," 1806-1838, under the editorship of Robert Aspland, W. J. Fox, R. H. Horne, and Leigh Hunt*. Univ. of North Carolina pr. Pp. xiv+458.

Rev. by Howard M. Jones in *SRL*, Nov. 25, p. 23; by O. Maurer, Jr., in *YR*, XXXIV (1945), 375-77; in *CE*, VI (1945), 242.

Monkswell, A. *A Victorian diarist: extracts from the journals of Mary Lady Monkswell, 1873-1895*. Ed. by E. C. F. Collier. London: Murray. Pp. 284.

Rev. by C. Vulliamy in *S*, pp. 532, 534; in *TLS*, Oct. 28, pp. 517, 524.

Montague, C. M. "Grub Street fights (a history of literary feuds)." *Poet lore*, XLIX, 340-54. See VB 1943, 244.

Morgan, Charles. *The house of Macmillan (1843-1943)*. See VB 1943, 244.

Rev. by J. Brandt in *JMH*, XVI, 233-34; by R. Chapman in *EHR*, LIX, 276-77; by H. G. F. in *Connoisseur*, XCIII, 61-62; by S. North in *Book week*, June 4, p. 2; by S. Ratcliffe in *CR*, CLXV, 254-55; by C. Rolo in *NYTBR*, June 11, p. 24; by O. Williams in *NR*, CCXXII, 78-83; in *QR*, CCLXXXII, 119-20.

Includes much about authors; publishes correspondence from, to, and about various authors. Some of these are Arnold, Lewis Carroll, Gladstone, Hardy, Hughes, Kingsley, Kipling, Morley, Pater, Shaw, Tennyson, Yeats.

Morice, G., and Eagle, F. "Victorian toy theatres, parlour pastimes and pursuits, and street games." *N & Q*, Oct. 7, pp. 157-59; Nov. 4, p. 241.

Morice, G.; Harting, H.; and Williams, C. D. "A record of some XIX-century London theatres." *N & Q*, Feb. 26, pp. 108-10; Apr. 8, pp. 175-76; Apr. 22, p. 212. See VB 1943, 244.

Mumby, F. A. *The house of Routledge, 1834-1934: with a history of Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and other associated firms*. London: Routledge, 1934. Pp. xiii+232.

Nettel, R. *Music in the five towns: a study of the social influence of music in an industrial district*. Oxford univ. pr. Pp. 120.

Rev. by P. M. Y. in *M & L*, XXV, 187.

Nevinson, Henry W. *Visions and memories*. Collected and arranged by Evelyn Sharp. Introd. by Gilbert Murray. Oxford univ. pr. Pp. 200.

Parker, W. M. "A visit to the Duke of Wellington." *Blackwood's mag.*, CCLVI, 77-82.

Polanyi, Karl. *The great transformation*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart. Pp. xiii+305.

Rev. by H. Kohn in *NYTBR*, May 14, p. 24. Covering the period from 1814 to 1914, this work includes an attack on nineteenth-century economic and political liberalism and, though designed to illuminate the present era, is nevertheless a valuable contribution to background studies in the Victorian period.

Ponsonby, Arthur. *Henry Ponsonby*. . . . See VB 1943, 245.

Rev. by F. Herriek in *AHR*, XLIX, 714-15; by M. Ross in *HTB*, Jan. 2, p. 3; by R. Schuyler in *PSQ*, LIX, 310-12.

"Q." *Memories and opinions: an unfinished autobiography*. Ed. with introd. by S. C. Roberts. Cambridge univ. pr. Pp. xiv+106.

Rev. by W. Rilla in *NS*, Dec. 16, pp. 410-11 ("breaking off tragically . . . in 1887"); in *TLS*, Dec. 9, p. 589.

"Quiller-Couch: novelist and the academic life: the poet as citizen." *TLS*, May 20, p. 246.

Quinlan, M. J. *Victorian prelude*. . . . See VB 1943, 245.

Rev. by R. Bald in *MLN*, LIX, 71-72.

Scanlan, Ross. "The challenge of Ibsen: a study in critical contradictions." On pp. 211-23 of *Studies in speech and drama in honor of Alexander M. Drummond*. Cornell univ. pr.

Sitwell, Osbert. *Left hand, right hand!* Boston: Little, Brown. Pp. xvi+327.

History of the Sitwell family and estate. Includes Victorian material. Rev. by R. Bates in *New R*, June 12, p. 791; by P. DeVries in *Book week*, May 14, p. 4; by E. Evans in *HTB*, May 14, p. 3; by C. Roberts in *NYTBR*, May 14, p. 4; by K. Willis in *LJ*, May 15, p. 460.

Slessor, Sir Henry. *A history of the Liberal party*. London: Hutchinson. Pp. 172.

Rev. in *S*, June 2, pp. 508, 510; in *TLS*, May 20, p. 242.

Spender, J. A. *Last essays*. London: Cassell. Pp. 186.

Rev. in *TLS*, Dec. 23, p. 620. Includes accounts of meetings with Arnold, Gladstone, Ruskin, etc.

Sprague, Arthur Colby. *Shakespeare and the actors: the stage business in his plays, 1660-1905*. Harvard univ. pr. Pp. xxvii+440.

Troubridge. See I, Troubridge.

Victoria, Queen. See II, Ponsonby.

Weitenkampf, Frank. "Influences and trends in nineteenth-century illustration." On pp. 345-50 of *Bookmen's holiday . . . in tribute to Harry Miller Lydenberg*. New York: New York pub. libr., 1943.

"As in other fields—e.g. literature and science—we have here, too, a variety in fine achievement that makes a consistently superior attitude towards the 'Victorian period' seem a bit fatuous."

West, Edward J. "Henry Irving, 1870-1890." On pp. 167-96 of *Studies in speech and drama in honor of Alexander M. Drummond*. Cornell univ. pr.

Williamson, Mary Paula. "Anglicanism is not Catholicism." *CWd*, CLVIII, 474-81.

Has many Victorian references.

III. MOVEMENTS OF IDEAS AND LITERARY FORMS; ANTHOLOGIES

Barzun, Jacques. *Romanticism and the modern ego*. See VB 1943, 246.

Rev. by H. Gregory in *KR*, VI, 157-60; by C. Harrold in *JEGP*, XLIII, 260-62; by E. Knowlton in *SAQ*, XLII, 417-18; in *TLS*, Aug. 19, p. 399 (see also pp. 411, 423).

Batho, Edith C. "The poet and the past." *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.*, 1937, pp. 29-50. See VB 1938, 405.

Bentley, Eric Russell. "Modern hero-worship: notes on Carlyle, Nietzsche, and Stefan George." *SeR*, LII, 441-56.

Especially emphasizes *On heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history* ("this atrocious but startling book").

Bentley, Eric Russell. *A century of hero-worship: a study of the idea of heroism in Carlyle and Nietzsche with notes on other hero-worshippers of modern times*. Philadelphia: Lippincott. Pp. 7+307.

Rev. by L. Bacon in *SRL*, Sept. 30, p. 14; by R. Bender in *Book week*, Oct. 8, p. 4; by R. Chase in *ParR*, XI, 471-72; by N. Chiaromonte in *New R*, Oct. 23, p. 526; by S. Colby in *NYTBR*, Oct. 29, p. 33; by S. Hook in *N*, Oct. 7, p. 412; by J. Krutch in *HTB*, Oct. 1, p. 5; in *Theatre arts*, XXVIII, 747.

Bowra, C. M. *The heritage of symbolism*. See VB 1943, 247.

Rev. by L. Leighton in *KR*, VI, 146-50.

Christy. See I, Christy.

Common, Jack. "Round the world in six acres." *Adelphi*, XVI, 136-41.

In comparing twentieth-century Russian communism with nineteenth-century British liberalism, explains Victorian liberalism as translation of Protestantism to the material world.

Disher, M. Willson. "The century of juvenile drama." *TLS*, Feb. 26, p. 108; see also March 4, p. 115, March 11, p. 132.

Downs, Brian W. "Anglo-Danish literary relations: the fortunes of Danish literature in Great Britain." *MLR*, XXXIX, 262-79.

Ford, George H. *Keats and the Victorians: a study of his influence and rise to fame, 1821-1895*. ("Yale studies in English," Vol. CI.) Yale univ. pr. Pp. xii+200.

Rev. by C. Baker in *NYTBR*, Dec. 31, pp. 8, 12.

Gohdes, Clarence. *American literature in nineteenth-century England*. Columbia univ. pr. Pp. ix+191.

Rev. by H. Blodgett in *AL*, XVI, 243-47 ("so closely packed are his chapters that they constitute summaries in themselves, and quotation is useless to convey an impression of their total weight"); by P. Boynton in *JMH*, XVI, 314; by E. Bradsher in *LQ*, XV (1945), 86-88 ("a scholarly book which no specialist in American literature should fail to read"); by H. Frenz in *JEGP*, XLIII, 485-87; by H. N. Smith in

MLN, LX (1945), 69-70; by P. Stern in *NYTBR*, June 11, p. 16.

The author states that this book is the first ever written with the purpose of proving the wide interest in American literature displayed by the English people. It succeeds in this purpose; and in the following two sentences I indicate two other ways in which it achieves notable success. This book makes an important addition to the slowly growing list of publications showing the interdependence of English and American literary work (creative and financial) in the nineteenth century. It provides, moreover, for present and future students of the period, suggestions that will lead to numerous further investigations and subsequent articles and books. For reasons given, the book deals chiefly with the period after 1832.

Chapter titles are "The booktrade," "The periodicals," "Humor," "Longfellow," "Of critics and influence." These make the book seem, at first glance, to be merely a collection of essays, but the author shows convincingly (pp. vii-viii) that the book is unified and the chapters are coherent.

I feel sure that the author could have written a book-length monograph on each of his chapter-topics. He is intentionally concise and selective: he informs us in the preface: "I have intended to present in simple exposition the broadest features of the topics along with a variety of particulars which serve as concrete illustrations." He points out, further, that a reader especially interested in the British reputation of only one of the major American writers can, by using the index, reconstruct from the scattered illustrations a "partial portrait."

A valuable appendix (pp. 150-80) lists "Representative articles on American literature appearing in British periodicals 1833 to 1901."

This is a scholarly book that no specialist in Victorian literature should fail to know.—W. D. T.

Grierson, H. J. C., and Smith, J. C. *A critical history of English poetry*. London: Chatto & Windus. Pp.viii+527.

Rev. by S. Shannon in *S*, Nov. 24, pp. 484, 486; in *TLS*, Dec. 2, p. 582. Has much on Victorian poetry.

Hazard, Paul. *Books, children, and men*. Trans. by Marguerite Mitchell. Boston: Horn Book, Inc. Pp. xiv+176.

Discussion of children's books in Europe and America, published in France in 1934; only now translated. Rev. by F. Sayers in *LQ*, XIV, 351

("no more important book on literature for children has appeared within the past decade"). Treats notable Victorians.

Heindel, Richard H. *The American impact on Great Britain, 1898-1914*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania pr., 1940. Pp. xix+439.

Hewett-Thayer. See *Meredith*.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American thought, 1860-1915*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania pr. Pp. viii+191.

Rev. by M. White in *JHI*, VI (1945), 119-22 ("has avoided discussing evolutionism in ethnology; he has also avoided discussing Darwinism in fiction . . . because he wants to solve one problem at a time. . . . But he does show what he wants to show: that there were as many American followers of Darwin who were mild, reasonable advocates of fraternity and social welfare as there were strenuous-lifers and ruthless imperialists").

Hubach, Robert R. "St. Louis: host of celebrated nineteenth century British and American authors." *Missouri hist. rev.*, XXXVIII, 375-87.

Includes mention of Arnold, Dickens, Marryat, Thackeray, Wilde.

"Imagining the future." *TLS*, Dec. 9, p. 591.

Many allusions to Victorians in relation to the postwar world.

Jaryc, Mark. "Studies of 1935-42 on the history of the periodical press." See VB 1943, 247.

Rev. by F. Francis in *Library*, 4th ser., XXIV, 205-7 (praise and additions).

Klinck, Carl F. *Wilfred Campbell: a study in late provincial Victorianism*. Toronto: Ryerson pr., 1942. Pp. xiii+289.

Larrabee, Stephen A. *English bards and Grecian marbles*. . . . See VB 1943, 247.

Rev. by H. Routh in *RES*, XX, 246-47; by R. Wellek in *PQ*, XXIII, 382-83.

Le Comte, Edward Semple. *Endymion in England: the literary history of a Greek myth*. New York: King's Crown pr. Pp. x+186. History from Spenser to Oscar Wilde.

Lewis, Charles Lee. *Books of the sea: an introduction to nautical literature*. Annapolis: U.S. Naval Institute, 1943. Pp. 318.

"The author does not pretend to list every book of the sea; probably some very good ones have been unintentionally overlooked. It is hoped, however, that the work may serve as a practical reader's guide." Surveys the entire field of books of the sea, even though with comparative superficiality. A critical account, usually of English and American books; three chapters give an account of sea stories, poetry, and plays in other languages. Final chapter treats "Essays and miscellanea." Reading list follows each chapter. Index, pp. 299-318. Frequent treatment of Victorians.

Liptzin, Sol. "Heine, the continuator of Goethe: a mid-Victorian legend." *JEGP*, XLIII, 317-25.

Deals chiefly with G. Eliot and M. Arnold.

Mammen, Edward W. "The old stock company: the Boston Museum and other 19th-century theaters." *More books*, XIX, 3-18, 49-63, 100-107, 132-49, 176-95.

Includes many references to Victorian actors and authors. Victorian publications are included in the bibliog. of books and articles on the old stock company (pp. 186-95).

Miles, Josephine. "The pathetic fallacy and the thing in itself." *Poetry*, LXII, 210-18.

Munson, Gorham. "Who are our favorite nineteenth-century authors?" *CE*, V, 291-96; also in *EJ*, XXXIII, 113-18.

Favorites "outside schoolrooms" include C. and E. Brontë, Trollope, Hardy, Thackeray, Dickens. Discusses reasons for Trollope's popularity.

Neff, Emery. *A revolution in European poetry, 1660-1900*. See VB 1943, 248.

Rev. by W. Liepe in *Germanic rev.*, XIX, 230-32.

Nolte, Fred O. *Art and reality*. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster pr., 1942. Pp. 188.

Rev. by E. Rose in *Germanic rev.*, XIX, 229-30 ("his preoccupation is with poetry").

Oates, W. J., and Murphy, C. T. *Greek literature in translation*. New York: Longmans, Green. Pp. xvi+1072.

Includes "A bibliography of works in English literature showing the influence of Greek authors," by C. G. Osgood and F. R. B. Godolphin.

O'Brien, Kate. *English diaries and journals*. ("Britain in pictures.") London: Collins, 1943. Pp. 47.

Rev. by T. James in *LL*, XL, 132 (personal criticism and an "accomplished catalogue of our most famous diarists . . . to Queen Victoria").

Oxford movement. See III, Smyth.

Peyre, Henri. *Writers and their critics: a study of misunderstanding*. Cornell univ. pr. Pp. xii+340.

Rev. by J. Frederick in *Book week*, Oct. 15, p. 2; by H. M. Jones in *NYTBR*, Nov. 12, p. 32.

Pinto, V. de S. "Russian poetry in English verse." *English*, V, 72-77.

Pre-Raphaelite movement. See II, Green.

Richardson, Dorothy. "Saintsbury and art for art's sake in England." *PMLA*, LIX, 243-60.

The erratic judgments of "the official critic of England" are to be explained by his having been an advocate of art for art's sake in his youth. The essential characteristics of the movement are listed and traced historically, and Saintsbury's relation to them is defined.

Sadleir, Michael. *Things past*. London: Constable. Pp. 276.

Rev. by L. Fowler in *S*, Oct. 13, p. 342; in *TLS*, Sept. 9, p. 435. Has some essays on Victorians.

Sanders, C. R. *Coleridge and the Broad Church movement*. . . . See VB 1943, 248.

Rev. by F. Curtin in *PhilosR*, LIII, 85-86; by C. Harrold in *JEGP*, XLIII, 137-39.

Shipley, Joseph T. (comp.). *Dictionary of world literature: criticism—forms—technique*. New York: Philos. libr., 1943. Pp. xv+633.

Rev. by C. Vincent in *QQ*, L (1943), 334; by R. Wellek in *PQ*, XXIII, 186-89; see also note by W. Oldfather in *PQ*, XXIII, 378-79.

Simmons, Ernest J. *An outline of modern Russian literature*. Cornell univ. pr. Pp. 93.

The bibliog. presents a selective guide to modern Russian literature in English translation (1880-1940).

Smith, Byron Porter. *Islam in English literature*. Beirut, Lebanon: Printed at the Amer. pr., 1939. Pp. xii+258.

The first chapter, on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, is very brief, so as to supplement rather than duplicate the material "so ably handled in Professor Chew's book *The crescent and the rose* (1937)." Studies intensively the Islamic material in English literature, with chapters on the ages of Dryden, Pope, and Johnson, one on the Romantic age and the Early Victorian age—and one on "The hero as prophet." This last discusses Carlyle's lecture on Mohammed and its subsequent effect on opinion concerning Mohammed and Islam and gives an estimate of the reception of *Heroes and hero-worship* by the Arab-speaking world. For each chapter after the first, the author's method is to present a brief summary of the political history of Moslem countries in the pertinent period and then a study of the records of travelers, the writings of historians and theologians, miscellaneous prose works, fiction, poetry, and the drama. In addition to the works of English authors, English translations from the Latin and from living European languages are considered. Unquestionably important in its field.—W. D. T.

Smyth, Charles. "The Evangelical movement in perspective." *Cambridge hist. jour.*, VII (1943), 160-74.

Very useful. Informative; also raises questions and suggests lines for future research.

Taylor, John Tinnon. *Early opposition to the English novel*. . . . See VB 1942, 338.

Rev. by D. Bond in *LQ*, XIV, 356-57.

Troy, William. "The new Parnassianism and recent poetry." *Chimera*, II (winter-spring) 3-16.

"Parnassianism" follows G. M. Hopkins.

Williams, Charles D. "A note on Pollock's plays." *N & Q*, Dec. 4, 1943, pp. 347-48, 354.

Contributions to drama, esp. juvenile.

Wormley, Stanton. *Heine in England*. See VB 1943, 249.

Rev. by S. Liptzin in *JEGP*, XLIII, 369-71.

IV. INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

Acton. Smith, R. A. L. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 355-56.

Brief discussion of Lord Acton.

Arnold (see also II, Morgan, Spender; III, Liptzin). *The complete poetical works of Matthew Arnold*. ("Oxford standard authors.") London: Milford; Oxford univ. pr., 1943.

Rev. in *N & Q*, Dec. 2, p. 264. A revision and enlargement: "all the poems that Arnold ever printed . . . with means of finding what at one date and another he thought their text should be"; a "remarkable and illuminating work of editing."

Annan, Noel. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 191.

On encounter between Arnold and Francis Newman over translating Homer.

Gr., W. W.; Looker, S. J.; and Russell, C. "Some blunders of celebrated authors." *N & Q*, Jan. 1, pp. 26-27; Jan. 15, p. 57; March 11, pp. 145-46. See VB 1943, 259.

Blunders by Arnold, Kipling, Meredith, Stevenson, Thackeray.

Gay, R. M. "Arnold's 'The scholar-gipsy.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, item 28.

Jones, Howard Mumford. "Arnold, aristocracy, and America." *AHR*, XLIX, 393-409.

Major, John C. "Matthew Arnold and Attie prose style." *PMLA*, LIX, 1086-1103.

Pottle, Frederick A. "Arnold's 'Dover Beach.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, item 45.

Templeman, William D. "A note on Arnold's 'Civilisation in the United States.'" *MLN*, LIX, 173-74.

Tillotson, Geoffrey. "Matthew Arnold: the critic and the advocate." On pp. 29-41 of *Essays by divers hands*, new ser., Vol. XX. Ed. by Gordon Bottomley. London: Milford; Oxford univ. pr., 1943.

Bagehot (see also II, *Economist*). Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, July 29, p. 74. Brief discussion of Bagehot.

Barnes, Thomas. Hudson, Derek. *Thomas Barnes of "The Times," with selections from his critical essays never before reprinted*. Ed. by Harold Child. New York: Macmillan. Pp. xii+196. See VB 1943, 250.

- Rev. by N. Balakian in *NYTBR*, March 19, p. 14; by H. Jordan in *AHR*, XLIX, 711-12; by C. New in *JMH*, XVI, 312-13; in *HTB*, Apr. 9, p. 10; in *N & Q*, Jan. 1, pp. 28-29; in *QR*, CCLXXXII, 122.
- Parker, W. M. "Thomas Barnes and 'The champion.'" *TLS*, Jan. 1, p. 7; reply by D. Hudson, Jan. 15, p. 31 (attributions to John Scott).
- Parker, W. M. "Thomas Mitchell and Thomas Barnes." *TLS*, May 27, p. 259.
- Barnes, William. "A Wessex Virgil: Barnes' 'Poems of rural life.'" *TLS*, July 1, p. 321.
- "William Barnes." *TLS*, July 1, p. 319 (editorial); see also p. 331.
- Beddoes, Gregory, Horace. "On the Gothic imagination in Romantic poetry and the survival of Thomas Lovell Beddoes." On pp. 45-61 of *The shield of Achilles: essays on beliefs in poetry*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Other essays included are: "On Walter Savage Landor and the elegiac tradition in English poetry" (pp. 76-89); "On Lewis Carroll's Alice and her White Knight and Wordsworth's *Ode* on immortality" (pp. 90-105); "On William Ernest Henley's editorial career" (pp. 106-18); "On George Moore and regionalism in realistic fiction" (pp. 119-35); "On William Butler Yeats and the mask of Jonathan Swift" (pp. 136-55).
- Rev. by B. Deutsch in *N*, Apr. 22, p. 486; by E. Drew in *HTB*, Apr. 23, p. 3; by J. Fletcher in *NYTBR*, Apr. 16, p. 3; by L. Kennedy in *Book week*, Apr. 23, p. 8; by F. Matthiessen in *New R*, Apr. 24, p. 568; by J. C. R. in *KR*, VI, 469-73; by T. Spencer in *SRL*, Apr. 29, p. 27; by A. Wanning in *ParR*, XI, 350-52.
- Howarth, R. G. "Beddoes: 'Drink my death.'" *N & Q*, June 17, p. 292.
- Error of "death" for "health."
- Beerbohm, Gallatin, Albert E. *Sir Max Beerbohm: bibliographical notes*. Ltd. ed. Harvard univ. pr. Pp. xvi+121.
- Rev. by C. Rollins in *SRL*, July 8, p. 18.
- "Max Beerbohm bibliography." *TLS*, Dec. 9, p. 600.
- Nowell-Smith, Simon. "'Max' at Charterhouse." *TLS*, Dec. 16, p. 611.
- Borrow, Telford, J. E., Jr. "Contemporary criticism of *Lavengro*: a re-examination." *SP*, XLI, 442-56.
- Braddon (see also Buisson). "Miss Braddon." *TLS*, Sept. 16, p. 456.
- Sadleir, Michael. "Miss Braddon." *TLS*, Oct. 10, 1942, p. 504.
- Summers, Montague. "Miss Braddon." *TLS*, Oct. 24, 1942, p. 528; Apr. 15, p. 192. See VB 1942, 340.
- Bridges (see also Hopkins: Price). Green, Andrew J. "Robert Bridges and the spiritual animal." *PhilosR*, LIII, 286-95.
- Nowell-Smith, Simon. "Bridges's classical prosody: new verses and variants." *TLS*, Aug. 28, 1943, p. 420; see also note by F. Hutchinson, *TLS*, Sept. 11, 1943, p. 444.
- Thompson, Edward. *Robert Bridges, 1844-1930*. Oxford univ. pr., Jan. 4, 1945. Pp. 140.
- Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 13, 1945, p. 13 ("sound estimate of the poet and his work, prepared for the centenary of his birth by one who knew him and . . . watched him at work").
- Brontës. Doods, M. Hope. "Heathcliff's country." *MLR*, XXXIX, 116-29.
- This article discussed in *N & Q*, June 17, pp. 281-82.
- Morgan, Charles. *Reflections in a mirror*. London: Macmillan. Pp. vii+225.
- Rev. by S. Jameson in *TLS*, Dec. 9, p. 594; by F. Swinnerton in *S*, Dec. 15, p. 558. Reprints the "Menander's mirror" series from the *TLS*, including articles on E. Brontë, Hardy, etc.
- Transactions and other publications of the Brontë Society*. Vol. IX. Parts XLVI-XLIX. Printed for the Society, 1940. Pp. 290. See also *HTB*, Dec. 3, p. 42.
- Brougham, Aspinall, A. "Lord Brougham's 'Life and times.'" *EHR*, LIX, 87-96.
- Brownings (see also II, Burton; Hardy: M., H. S.; Meynell; Shaw: Smalley). B., B. "A Browning-Byron parallel." *N & Q*, March 11, p. 160.
- B., E. I. "Mrs. Browning and Hans Andersen." *N & Q*, Feb. 12, p. 92.

- B., E. I., and Sayar. "Browning's botany." *N & Q*, Jan. 1, p. 26; Jan. 15, p. 56. See VB 1943, 250.
- Charlton, H. B. "Poetry and truth: an aspect of Browning's *The ring and the book*." *JRL*, XXVIII, 43-57.
- Cook, Viola. "Browning's 'Parley' and De Lassay's 'Mémoire.'" *MLN*, LIX, 553-56.
- Browning used not De Lassay but Sainte-Beuve.
- Ed. "Can it be Browning?" *N & Q*, July 29, pp. 57-58.
- Query about a poem attributed to Browning.
- Editors and Campbell, H. M. "Browning's 'Prospice.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, item 53; Vol. III, item 2.
- Friedland, L. S. "Browning's 'The glove.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, item 30.
- Haines, L. F. "Mill and 'Pauline': the 'review' that 'retarded' Browning's fame." *MLN*, LIX, 410-12.
- Hannon, Rachel. "Imagery and the adding-machine." *CE*, VI, 6-13.
- Includes discussion of Smith's *Browning's star-imagery* (see VB 1941, 404).
- Hibernicus and J., W. H. "Conundrums from Chesterton's *Browning*." *N & Q*, Oct. 21, pp. 180-81; Dec. 30, pp. 301-2.
- L., G. G., and Strachan, L. "Browning's limpet." *N & Q*, Oct. 21, p. 194; Nov. 4, p. 237.
- Memorabilist. "On *The ring and the book*." *N & Q*, May 6, p. 215.
- Phelps, William Lyon. "A conversation with Browning." *ELH*, XI, 154-60.
- Unpublished letter written in 1883 by a fifteen-year-old girl describing an interview.
- Price, Frances. "Some uncollected letters of Mrs. Browning." *N & Q*, Nov. 18, pp. 227-31.
- Letters to Cornelius Mathews which first appeared in *Pictures of the living authors of Britain* (1849), by Thomas Powell.
- Stevenson, Lionel. "Tennyson, Browning and a romantic fallacy." *TQ*, XIII, 175-95.
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar. *From Shakespeare to Joyce: authors and critics: literature and life*. New York: Doubleday. Pp. xx+442.
- Includes material on Browning, Dickens, and Kipling. Rev. by S. C. Chew in *HTB*, Apr. 30, p. 8; by L. Kronenberger in *N*, Feb. 19, p. 229; by R. Roberts in *SRL*, March 4, p. 9; by M. Schorer in *NYTBR*, Feb. 6, p. 7; in *Book week*, March 12, p. 8; in *TLS*, March 18, p. 138.
- Templeman, W. D.; Pottle, F. A.; Basler, R. P.; and Dickson, Arthur. "Browning's 'A toccata of Galuppi's.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, items 25, 60; Vol. III, item 15.
- W., A. C. "*Vanity Fair*, 11 December 1875." *N & Q*, Feb. 12, pp. 102-3.
- Quotes long rev. of *The inn album*.
- Wilsey, Mildred. "Elizabeth Barrett Browning's heroine." *CE*, VI, 75-81.
- Autobiographical elements in *Aurora Leigh*.
- Wilson, Grace Elizabeth. *Robert Browning's portraits, photographs and other likenesses and their makers*. Ed. by A. J. Armstrong. Waco, Tex.: Baylor univ., 1943. Pp. 196+98 portraits.
- Buisson, Ada. Evans, F. B. "Ada Buisson." *TLS*, Dec. 23, p. 621; see also *TLS*, Nov. 23.
- Biographical information about a real person (not to be confused with Miss Braddon), novelist (1839-66).
- Bulwer-Lytton. Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 259.
- Discusses literature of utopias, particularly Bulwer-Lytton's *The coming race*.
- Butler (see also Disraeli: Cline). Forster, E. M. "Books in general." *NS*, July 15, p. 43.
- Brief discussion of *Erewhon*.
- Holt, Lee Elbert. "Samuel Butler's revisions of *Erewhon*." *BSP*, XXXVIII, 22-38.
- Carlyle (see also III, Bentley; Brownings: Memorabilist). B., E. "Wordsworth in Italy." *N & Q*, Jan. 15, p. 48.
- Quotes part of a letter from John Carlyle to his brother Thomas, June 12, 1837, about an expedition to Tivoli.
- Deaton, Mary B. "Thomas Carlyle's use of metaphor." *CE*, V, 314-18.

- Holmberg, Olle. "David Hume in Carlyle's *Sartor resartus*." *Årsberättelse 1933-1934: Bulletin de la Société royale des lettres de Lund 1933-1934*, pp. 91-109. See VB 1935, 425.
- Lea, Frank A. *Carlyle: prophet of to-day*. London: Routledge, 1943. Pp. viii+178.
Rev. by H. Fausset in *Adelphi*, XX, 61-62.
- Parry, John J. "A plea for better anthologies." *CE*, V, 318-24.
Includes notes on "Baphometric fire baptism" and the reason for Carlyle's choice of the name "Teufelsdröckh."
- Reilly, Joseph J. "Jane Carlyle appraises her contemporaries." *CWD*, CLVIII, 443-51.
- T., C. "G. F. Watts and Carlyle." *N & Q*, Feb. 26, pp. 114-15.
- G. K. Chesterton on Watts's portrait of Carlyle.
- Wellek, René. "Carlyle and the philosophy of history." *PQ*, XXIII, 55-76.
Brief critical analysis of Mrs. Young's *Thomas Carlyle and the art of history* and Mr. Shine's *Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians: the concept of historical periodicity*, leads to more general discussion, in which is emphasized the influence of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Herder, and other German Romantics on Carlyle's ideas on history.
- Carpenter. "Poet of democracy: Edward Carpenter: aeons of peace and progress." *TLS*, Sept. 2, p. 426; see also p. 439.
- Carroll (see II, Morgan; III, Hazard; Beddoes: Gregory).
- Clough, Palmer, Francis W. "The bearing of science on the thought of Arthur Hugh Clough." *PMLA*, LIX, 212-25.
- Coleridge, Mary. Chitty, Jessie E. "Charlotte Yonge and Mary Coleridge." *TLS*, March 25, p. 151; see also pp. 175, 199 (Apr. 8, 15).
- Conrad, Dean, Leonard F. "Tragic pattern in Conrad's 'The heart of darkness.'" *CE*, VI, 100-104.
- Wright, Walter F. "Joseph Conrad's critical views." *Research studies, State College of Washington*, XII, 155-75.
- Corelli. Bullock, George. "The Corelli wonder." *LL*, XLI, 140-47.
- Darwin (see also III, Hofstadter). Altrocchi, Rudolph. "God and Darwin reconciled." On pp. 227-41 of his *Sleuthing in the stacks*. Harvard univ. pr.
Discussions of Darwin's theories in letters (1889-97) between Antonio Fogazzaro, Italian novelist, and Joseph Le Conte, Univ. of California professor.
- Davies, L. M. "Darwinism." *NC*, CXXXV, 27-36.
- Dewar, Douglas. "The man from monkey myth." *NC*, CXXXV, 160-68.
- Dickens (see also II, Hutchinson; Brownings: Stoll). *Dickensian* (quarterly), Vols. XL-XLI (Nos. 269-73). See VB 1932, 422.
Items as follows: "Some Dickens patients [treats of 'Charles Dickens: neuropsychiatrist,' by Dr. W. R. Brain, in the *London hospital gazette*]" (XL, 132); "Uncollected speeches: XI: The Royal General Theatrical Fund, April 4th, 1863" (XLI, 15-20); K. Bromhill, "Phiz's illustrations to *David Copperfield*" (XL, 47-50, 83-86); K. Bromhill, "Phiz's illustrations to *Bleak House*" (XL, 146-50, 192-95); T. K. Brumleigh, "Autoplagerism" (XL, 9-11); W. Dexter, "Twice twenty-one: the fellowship in retrospect" (XL, 25-35, 97-101, 127-32); W. Dexter and K. Bromhill, "The *David Copperfield* advertiser" (XLI, 21-25); Roger Green, "Andrew Lang: critic and Dickensian" (XLI, 10-14; includes list of Lang's writings on Dickens); T. W. Hill, "Drood time in *Cloisterham*" (XL, 113-17); T. Hill, "Notes on *Bleak House*" (XL, 39-44, 65-70, 133-41; see also article by W. Woolliams, XLI, 26-29); T. Hill, "Notes on *The mystery of Edwin Drood*" (XL, 198-204; XLI, 30-37); T. Hill, "Notes to *David Copperfield*" (XL, 11-14); J. H. McNulty, "*Bleak House* and *Macbeth*" (XL, 188-91); J. McNulty, "Leacock on Dickens" (XL, 204-6); Leo Mason, "The message of Dickens" (XL, 3-8); J. B. Priestley, "New judgment" (XL, 61-63); R. E. Rigg, "The fascination of the sea" (XL, 89-96, 151-58); E. Trory, "Dickens in the Soviet Union" (XL, 82—see also XL, 167, account of Russian editions, and XLI, 3); P. C. Williams, "The soldier in Dickens" (XLI, 48-51).
- Boll, Ernest. "Charles Dickens and Washington Irving." *MLQ*, V, 453-67.

- Boll, Ernest. "The plotting of *Our mutual friend*." *MP*, XLII, 96-122.
- C., D. "A mystery of *Edwin Drood*." *N & Q*, March 11, pp. 131-33; Apr. 8, p. 184.
Relation of Dickens' story to Robert Lytton's *John Ackland*.
- Ed.; Cox, A.; and Kent, W. "The antient society of cogens." *N & Q*, Feb. 12, p. 94; March 11, pp. 144-45; Apr. 8, pp. 184-85.
- Fynmore, A. H. W. "A Dickens manuscript." *N & Q*, Dec. 2, p. 255.
MS of *Our mutual friend* sold for \$17,000.
- Hutchens, Carolyn W. and Lawrence H. "Three early works attributed to Dickens." *PMLA*, LIX, 226-35.
- Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 143.
Brief discussion of *Edwin Drood*.
- Roe, F. Gordon. "Queen Victoria meets Mr. Pickwick: and some bogus Pickwickiana." *Connoisseur*, CXIV, 105-7.
- Simpson, Evelyn. "Jonson and Dickens: a study in the comic genius of London." On pp. 82-92 of *Essays and studies . . . of the English Assoc.*, Vol. XXIX. Ed. Una Ellis-Fermor. Oxford: Clarendon pr.
- Disraeli, Cline, C. L. "*Coningsby* and three Victorian novelists." *N & Q*, Jan 15, pp. 41-42.
Allusions in the writings of Butler, Thackeray, Trollope.
- Cline, C. L. "The unfinished diary of Disraeli's journey to Flanders and the Rhineland, 1824." *Univ. of Texas . . . studies in English*, 1943, pp. 94-114.
- R., J. D. "No pride of ancestry or hope of posterity." *N & Q*, Apr. 8, pp. 189-90.
Derived from *Coningsby*?
- Stapledon, Sir George. *Disraeli and the new age*. London: Faber, 1943. Pp. 175.
Rev. in *QR*, CCLXXXII, 249; in *TLS*, Apr. 8, p. 176.
- Dobell, Sackville, Lady Margaret, and Eva Dobell. "Sydney Dobell, nature poet." *Poetry rev.*, XXXV, 187-88.
- Dowson. Longaker, Mark. *Ernest Dowson*. Univ. of Pennsylvania pr.; London: Milford. Pp. x+282.
A biography, based on oral and written reports, including letters from Dowson's friends to the author and many hitherto unpublished letters by Dowson to his friends; new letters from Oscar Wilde to Dowson are used. Rev. by L. Bacon in *SRL*, Oct. 14, p. 54; by C. Baker in *NYTBR*, Oct. 8, p. 4; by K. Coburn, in *Canadian forum*, XXIV, 190; by G. Whicher in *HTB*, Oct. 29, p. 19; in *CE*, VI, 184; in *New R*, CX, 670.
- Doyle. *Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson: a textbook of friendship*. Ed. Christopher Morley. New York: Harcourt, Brace. Pp. 366.
Reprints of several Holmes stories.
- Queen, Ellery (ed.). *The misadventures of Sherlock Holmes*. Boston: Little, Brown. Pp. xxii+363.
Anthology of parodies and imitations of Doyle narratives.
- Smith, Edgar Wadsworth (ed.). *Profile by gaslight: an irregular reader about the private life of Sherlock Holmes*. New York: Simon & Schuster. Pp. xv+312.
Essays and poems by various hands. Rev. by M. Becker in *HTB*, Apr. 9, p. 4; by H. Haycraft in *NYTBR*, Apr. 2, p. 1; in *SRL*, Apr. 1, p. 26.
- Eliot (see also III, Liptzin). Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVIII, 170.
Brief discussion of George Eliot.
- Q., D. "Debasing the moral currency." *N & Q*, Feb. 12, p. 103.
Source of a phrase used by Lord Acton shown to be *Impressions of Theophrastus Such*.
- Fox, William Johnson (see II, Mineka).
- Gaskell. Lichfield, Dean of. "'Cold loin' at Cranford." *TLS*, Jan. 15, p. 36; see also Jan. 22, p. 48.
- Gissing. "Gissing's academic career." *TLS*, May 20, p. 252.
- W., D. G. "The Adams-Gissing collection." *Yale univ. libr. gazette*, XVIII, 49. See VB 1942, 344.
- Gladstone (see II, Birkenhead, Morgan, Spender).

- Haggard**, Green, Roger Lancelyn. "*He, She, and It.*" *TLS*, May 27, p. 264; see also June 17, July 1, pp. 300, 324.
- Hallam**. *The writings of Arthur Hallam*. See VB 1943, 253.
Rev. by J. Baker in *PQ*, XXIII, 95-96; by S. Coblenz in *Poet lore*, L, 278-79; by H. Lowry in *MLN*, LIX, 426-27.
- Hardy** (see also I, Church; II, Morgan; III, Munson, Peyre; **Barnes**: "A Wessex . . ."; **Brontës**: Morgan; **Housman**: Woodbridge). *The three wayfarers*. Ed. with introd. and notes by Carl J. Weber. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints. Pp. xvi+53. Facsimile of Hardy's dramatization (1893) of "The three strangers." Rev. in *TLS*, July 8, p. 336.
- Anon. "Morals and masterpieces." *TLS*, Dec. 4, 1943, p. 583.
Tess and "the problem raised by Hardy."
- Cecil, Lord David. *Hardy the novelist: an essay in criticism*. See VB 1943, 253-54.
The Clark Lectures delivered in 1942 at Trinity College, Cambridge. They discuss Hardy's scope, power, art, weakness, and style. The lectures are fresh and stimulating, and Cecil has found many new things to say on old subjects and says them in a particularly attractive way. Like others who have studied the Wessex novels, he emerges with a sincere admiration for Hardy; in fact, "we do not just admire, we love him. . . . Behind the work stands the man." This excellent book ends with words well worth quoting in 1945: "Hardy was never hard. . . . The burning flame of his charity blazed all the higher for the infinite and unrelieved blackness of the universe."—Carl J. Weber.
- Clemens, Cyril. *My chat with Thomas Hardy*. Introd. by Carl J. Weber. Webster Groves, Mo.: International Mark Twain Soc. Pp. 32. See VB 1943, 254.
Account of a call in 1925. Hardy's opinions of certain English and American writers. Rev. by L. Payne, Jr., in *Mark Twain quar.*, VI (summer-fall), 21-22.
- Gifford, Gordon. "The first Mrs. Thomas Hardy." *TLS*, Jan. 1, p. 7.
- Gregory, Horace, with M. Zaturenska. "The vein of comedy in E. A. Robinson's poetry." *AB*, I, 43-64.
- Honig, Camille. "In search of Thomas Hardy." *NS*, June 10, pp. 384-85.
A soldier visits Max Gate; talks with townspeople about Hardy.
- Ignoto. "Blunders in quotation." *N & Q*, Apr. 22, p. 208.
Printing blunder in *Jude the obscure*, 1886 ed.
- Libbey, David. "A visit to Max Gate." *Bull. of the Maine libr. assoc.*, V, 28-31. See also *TLS*, Sept. 2, p. 427.
- M., H. S. "An anachronism in Thomas Hardy." *N & Q*, May 20, pp. 246-47.
Hardy quotes from a Browning poem published twenty years after the supposed date of the story "The waiting supper."
- Purdy, Richard L. "Thomas Hardy and Florence Henniker: the writing of *The spectre of the real*." *Colby libr. quar.*, I, 122-26.
- Roberts, Marguerite. "The dramatic element in Hardy's poetry." *QQ*, LI, 429-38.
- Weber, Carl J. *Hardy of Wessex*. . . . See VB 1941, 411.
Rev., with Cecil's *Hardy the novelist*, by J. Macdonald in *TQ*, XIII, 476-80.
- Weber, Carl J. "*The spectre after fifty years*." *Colby libr. quar.*, I, 126-28.
- Henley** (see also **Beddoes**: Gregory). McLuhan, H. M. "Henley's 'Invictus.'" *Ex*, Vol. III, item 22.
- Hopkins** (see also III, Troy). Gardner, W. H. *Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889): a study of the poetic idiosyncrasy in relation to poetic tradition*. Foreword by Gerard Hopkins. London: Seeker & Warburg. Pp. xvi+304.
Rev. by G. Stonier, in *NS*, Nov. 4, pp. 307-8; in *TLS*, Nov. 11, p. 550.
- Hopkins, Gerard. "Gerard Manley Hopkins." *TLS*, June 24, p. 309.
On the correct date of the poet's birth.
- Kenyon review: Hopkins centennial*.
The summer number (Vol. VI, No. 3) contains four articles on Hopkins, and the autumn (No. 4) contains three. In order of appearance, they are: Herbert Marshall McLuhan, "The analogical mirrors" (pp. 322-32); Harold Whitehall, "Sprung rhythm" (pp. 333-54); Josephine

Miles, "The sweet and lovely language" (pp. 355-68); Austin Warren, "Instreass of inscape" (pp. 369-82); Robert Lowell, "A note" (pp. 583-86); Austin Warren, "Monument not quite needed" (pp. 587-89); Arthur Mizener, "Victorian Hopkins" (pp. 590-606).

In summarizing, Mizener says (p. 606) that the following conviction is "explicitly or implicitly endorsed" by all the contributors to the symposium: "that Hopkins is Victorian, in a good many respects obviously Victorian; and that it is only the integrity and skill with which he fulfilled the other impulses of his nature which tends to hinder our recognition of the fact that even in these impulses he represents his time."

Kliger, Samuel. "God's 'plenitude' in the poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins." *MLN*, LIX, 408-10.

Leavis, F. R. "Evaluations (IV): Gerard Manley Hopkins." *Scrutiny*, XII, 82-93.

Centenary article, attempting to indicate the place of Hopkins among English poets. A note on p. 85 refers to an essay by Moore, to appear in the *Downside rev.* for September, dealing with the relation of Hopkins to Duns Scotus.

Leavis, F. R. "Gerard Manley Hopkins." On pp. 159-93 of his *New bearings in English poetry*. . . . London: Chatto & Windus, 1932.

Pick, John. *Gerard Manley Hopkins*. . . . See VB 1943, 254-55.

Rev. by A. MacGillivray in *Poet lore*, L, 276-78.

"Poet and priest: Gerard Manley Hopkins: 1844-1889: the 'Dare-Gale skylark.'" *TLS*, June 10, pp. 282, 284; see also editorial, p. 283.

Price, Fanny. "G. M. Hopkins on Robert Bridges." *N & Q*, Jan. 15, p. 49.

Ruggles, Eleanor. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: a life*. New York: Norton. Pp. 8+305.

Rev. by D. Abel in *SAQ*, XLII, 415-17; by W. Auden in *New R*, Aug. 21, p. 223; by H. Gregory in *HTB*, Aug. 6, p. 5; by L. Kennedy in *Book week*, Aug. 13, p. 9; by R. Lowell in *SeR*, LIII (1945), 136-40 ("another volume to the already menacing libraries of pleasantly academic substitutes for our English classics"); by H. McLuhan in *NYTBR*, Sept. 3, pp. 7, 14; by T. Spencer in *SRL*, Sept. 2, p. 20; by A.

Warren in *KR*, VI, 587-89 ("Monument not quite needed").

Turner, W. J. "Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-89)." *S*, July 14, pp. 32-33.

Horne, R. H. (see II, Mineka).

Housman. Carter, John. "A poem of A. E. Housman." *TLS*, June 12, 1943, p. 288. See VB 1943, 255.

Uses "The sage to the young man" to show how study of Housman's MSS throws light on textual evolution of his work.

Explicator: A. E. Housman number, Vol. II, No. 5 (March).

Items as follows: 34: T. S. K. Scott-Craig, C. C. Walcutt, and Cleanth Brooks, "Housman's '1887'"; 35: F. A. Philbrick and R. P. Boas, "Housman's 'Revolution'"; 36: Frank Sullivan, "Housman's 'Farewell to barn and stack and tree'"; 37: Louise Boas, "Housman's 'The immortal part'"; 38: W. L. Werner, "Housman's 'Epitaph on an army of mercenaries'"; 39: editors, "Housman's 'When Israel out of Egypt came'"; 40: Robert Stallman, "*Explications de texte* on the poetry of Housman: a check-list." Item in *Ez*, Vol. III: 6: Louise Boas, "Housman's 'The merry guide.'"

Haber, Tom B. "Heine and Housman." *JEGP*, XLIII, 326-32.

Symons, Katharine E. "A. E. Housman and music." *M & L*, XXV, 60-61.

Reminiscences by Housman's sister. Prompted by article in *M & L* by William White. See VB 1943, 255.

Walcutt, Charles C. "Housman and the empire: an analysis of '1887.'" *CE*, V, 255-58.

Werner, W. L. "Housman's '1887'—no satire." *CE*, VI, 165-66.

Disagrees with Walcutt; cf. article above.

Woodbridge, Benjamin M. "Poets and pessimism: Vigny, Housman *et alii*." *RoR*, XXXV, 43-51.

Includes treatment of Thomas Hardy, Leopardi, James Thomson. See VB 1941, 412: Whitridge on Vigny and Housman.

Hughes, Thomas (see II, Morgan).

Huxley. Teller, James D. "Huxley on the aims of education." *Ed. forum*, VIII, 317-23.

- Jefferies.** Looker, S. J. "Bibliographical discoveries in the work of Richard Jefferies." "A bird query in Richard Jefferies." "Richard Jefferies (1848-1887)." *N & Q*, Feb. 12, pp. 91-92; Feb. 12, p. 96; Oct. 7, p. 169.
- Jefferies' countryside: nature essays.* Ed. with introd. and notes by Samuel J. Looker. London: Constable. Pp. 328.
- The Worthing cavalcade: concerning Richard Jefferies, by various hands.* Ed. Samuel J. Looker. Worthing, Sussex: Aldridge Bros. Rev. in *N & Q*, Oct. 21, pp. 197-98.
- Jerome.** P. W. H. "The illustrator of *Three men in a boat*." *N & Q*, June 17, pp. 292-93. On Arthur Frederics.
- Kingsley** (see also II, Morgan). Annan, Noel. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 209. Newman versus Kingsley about truth-telling.
- Kipling** (see also II, Morgan; **Brownings**: Stoll). Green, R. L. "The hope of the Katze-kopfs." *N & Q*, March 25, pp. 152-53. On a children's book of 1844 that influenced Kipling and perhaps Thackeray.
- McLuhan, H. M. "Kipling and Forster." *SeR*, LII, 332-43.
- Landor** (see also **Beddoes**: Gregory). Chambers, E. K. "Some notes on Walter Savage Landor." *RES*, XX, 147-54.
- Elwin, Malcolm. "Landor and Alfieri." *TLS*, Feb. 26, p. 103.
- Hubbell, Jay B. "Some new letters of Walter Savage Landor." *Virginia mag. of hist. and biog.*, LI (1943), 283-96.
- Lang** (see also **Dickens**: *Dickensian*: Green). Green, Roger Lancelyn. "Andrew Lang and the fairy tale." *RES*, XX, 227-31.
- Green, Roger L. "Andrew Lang: poet and romantic: 1844-1912." *English*, V, 37-44.
- Parker, W. M. "Andrew Lang's works." *TLS*, Apr. 1, p. 168. Addition to bibliog. in *CBEL*.
- Hamilton, Ian. "Andrew Lang." *TLS*, Apr. 8, p. 175.
- Lockhart.** Brightfield, Myron F. "Lockhart's *Quarterly* contributors." *PMLA*, LIX, 491-512.
- Identification of contributors, including many Victorians.
- Parker, W. M. "Lockhart's *obiter dicta*." *TLS*, Feb. 5, p. 72; Feb. 12, p. 84. Excerpts from letters, including opinion of Thackeray, etc.
- Rendall, Vernon. "Lockhart's life of Scott." *TLS*, Jan. 8, p. 24.
- Strout, Alan Lang. "Some unpublished letters of John Gibson Lockhart to John Wilson Croker." *N & Q*, Sept. 9, pp. 112-15; Sept. 23, pp. 134-37; Oct. 7, pp. 163-65; Oct. 21, pp. 186-88; Nov. 4, pp. 206-10; Nov. 18, pp. 225-27. See VB 1943, 256.
- Lytton, Robert** (see **Dickens**: D., C.).
- Martineau.** Nevill, John C. *Harriet Martineau*. See VB 1943, 256. Rev. by A. Robinson in *EcJ*, LIV, 120-23.
- Riolin, Joseph B. "Harriet Martineau." *TLS*, Jan. 8, p. 24; see reply by Mildred Martineau, Jan. 22, p. 48.
- Meredith.** Cust, Nina. "Meredith's 'Hymn.'" *TLS*, Dec. 16, p. 611.
- Graham, W. H. "A lord of creation." *NR*, CXXII, 342-45. Analysis of Sir Willoughby Patterne.
- Hewett-Thayer, H. W. "Ferdinand Lassalle in the novels of Spielhagen and Meredith." *Germanic rev.*, XIX, 186-96.
- Hudson, R. B. "Meredith's 'The egoist' as a play." *MLN*, LIX, 165-68.
- "Menander's mirror: loyalties of taste." *TLS*, Apr. 15, p. 183. A defense of Meredith's poetry.
- Sadler, Michael. "*The shaving of Shagpat*." *TLS*, Jan. 8, p. 24 (bibliog. note).
- Meynell** (see also **Brownings**: Meynell; **Patmore**: B., B.). "Letters of Elizabeth Barrett Browning." *N & Q*, Dec. 16, pp. 272-73. First printing of a heavily revised version of the article by Alice Meynell which originally appeared in the *Pall-Mall gazette* for March 11, 1897.
- Price, Fanny. "Alice Meynell: some uncollected verse." *N & Q*, Dec. 30, pp. 295-96.

- Mill** (see also **Brownings**: Haines). *The spirit of the age*. See VB 1943, 257.
Rev. by W. Knickerbocker in *MLN*, LIX, 210-11.
- Summers, R.** "John Stuart Mill and liberty." *Adelphi*, XX, 39-45.
- Moore** (see also **Beddoes**: Gregory). Gettman, Royal A. "George Moore's revisions of *The lake*, *The wild goose*, and *Esther Waters*." *PMLA*, LIX, 540-55.
- Morley** (see also II, Morgan). Knickerbocker, Frances W. *Free minds: John Morley and his friends*. See VB 1943, 257.
Rev. by C. Harrold in *MP*, XLI, 265-66; by D. Raymond in *JMH*, XVI, 76-77; in *HTB*, Apr. 9, p. 9.
- Staebler, Warren.** *The liberal mind of John Morley*. See VB 1943, 257.
Rev. by E. Everett in *MLN*, LIX, 435-36; by C. Harrold in *MP*, XLI, 265-66; by C. Payne in *JMH*, XVI, 148; by W. Willcox in *AHR*, XLIX, 462-63.
- Villiers, Marjorie.** "Nineteenth century commentary." *QR*, CCLXXXII, 328-41.
Description of the unpublished letters of Mrs. George Villiers to her brother, Lord Morley, with quotations.
- Morris, Phillips, Lawrence, and Wadimar.** "William Morris." *N & Q*, May 6, p. 229; June 3, p. 278.
About a statement in *News from nowhere*.
- Short, Clarice.** "William Morris and Keats." *PMLA*, LIX, 513-23.
Parallel passages indicating that Morris imitated Keats to a considerable degree.
- Morrison, Arthur.** Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, XXVII, 61.
Brief discussion of *Tales of mean streets* (1894).
- Newman** (see also **Kingsley**; **White**). *A Newman treasury*. . . . Ed. C. F. Harrold. See VB 1943, 257.
Rev. by E. Mossner in *MLN*, LIX, 437; by C. Sisson in *MLR*, XXXIX, 418-19; by W. Templeman in *JEGP*, XLIII, 262-63.
- Holahan, Sister Mary B.** *Newman in France*. Abstract of Univ. of Illinois diss. Urbana, Ill., 1943. Pp. 11.
- P., S. C., and Crosse, Gordon. "John Henry Newman and a prayer." *N & Q*, Jan. 29, p. 72; Feb. 26, p. 118.
- Pater** (see also II, Morgan). Coll, E. "Q and Pater." *TLS*, Dec. 16, p. 611.
- Law, Helen H.** "Pater's use of Greek quotations." *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 575-85.
- Patmore, B., B.** "Byron, Patmore, and Alice Meynell." *N & Q*, June 3, pp. 267-68.
- P., F. "Patmore, Stevenson, and Cordelia." *N & Q*, July 1, p. 15.
Patmore and Stevenson on Cordelia's reticence.
- Price, Fanny.** "A topographical poem." *N & Q*, Feb. 26, p. 114.
On Patmore's *Tamerton church-tower*.
- Pearce, Pinto, V. de S.** "A Victorian water-poet." *N & Q*, May 20, pp. 243-45.
Poems on swimming by a swimming teacher (1843).
- Praed.** Note on *Etoniana*. *N & Q*, Jan. 29, p. 61. See VB 1942, 348.
Says that *Etoniana* for Dec. 28, 1943, brings to an end the printing of a series of letters written by Praed from Eton.
- Reade.** "Fact, realism, and morality in Reade's fiction." *SP*, XLI, 582-98.
- Robinson.** Latham, E.,; Algar, A.; Ed. "Emma Robinson." *N & Q*, May 6, p. 228; June 3, p. 276.
An obscure Victorian novelist.
- Summers, Montague.** "Emma Robinson, author of *Whitefriars*." *TLS*, Jan. 22, p. 48.
- Rossetti.** Culler, Dwight and Helen. "The sources of 'The King's tragedy.'" *SP*, XLI, 427-41.
- Preston, Kerrison.** *Blake and Rossetti*. London: A. Moring Ltd., De La More pr. Pp. 111. Twelve pp. illus. and three pp. diagrams.
Rev. by H. G. F. in *Connoisseur*, CXIV, 60-61; in *TLS*, June 24, p. 309.
- Ruskin** (see also II, Birkenhead, Spender). Fain, John T. "Ruskin and his father." *PMLA*, LIX, 236-42.
Characteristic works on political economy delayed ten years by persistent discouragement of his father.

- Hagstotz, Hilda. *The educational theories of John Ruskin*. See VB 1942, 348.
 Rev. by W. H. Dunn in *MLN*, LIX, 216-17.
- Whitehouse, J. Howard. "Ruskin's influence today." *CR*, CLXV, 105-8.
- Saintsbury (see III, Richardson).
- Scott, John (see Barnes, Thomas: Parker).
- Shaw (see also II, Morgan). Nathan, George Jean. "George Bernard Shaw." *Amer. mercury*, LVIII, 233-38.
Saturday review of literature: G. B. S. birthday issue. July 22.
 Includes "Four visits to Shaw": (1) John Mason Brown, "Back to Methuselah" (pp. 6-9); (2) Lawrence Langner, "The sinner-saint as host" (pp. 10-12); (3) Henry S. Canby, "G. B. S. in the last war" (p. 12); (4) Bennett Cerf, "Oh, Shaw!" (pp. 24-25); also Donald Smalley, "Mephistopheles at the conventicle: G. B. S. amid the Brownings" (pp. 13-15); "What they said about Shaw" (p. 16); J. D. Thomas, "The 'Unsocial socialist'" (pp. 17-18); "Malicious afterthoughts" (p. 19); editorial, by H. S., "On an elderly gentleman" (p. 20); "G. B. S.—a bibliography" (pp. 28, 30, 32).
- Shelley, Mary. *The letters of Mary W. Shelley*. Ed. Frederick L. Jones. Norman, Okla.: Univ. of Oklahoma pr. 2 vols. Pp. xxxii+379; xx+390.
 Rev. by G. Whicher in *HTB*, Dec. 31, p. 2.
- Sims, Boll, T. E. M. "George R. Sims." *TLS*, Sept. 18, 1943, p. 451. Reply, Oct. 2, p. 475.
- Sterling. "John Sterling as hero." *TLS*, Sept. 23, p. 463 (editorial on centenary of Sterling's death).
- Stevenson (see also Patmore: P., F.). Ashe, Matthew J. "Stevenson after fifty years." *CWd*, CLX, 241-45.
- Barton, J. E. "What are 'poetic' words?" *CLS*, XII, 1-4.
- D., F. "Treasure Island and Captain Singleton." *N & Q*, Jan. 15, p. 51.
- Ed. "To Theobald Boehm, flautist." *N & Q*, Dec. 30, p. 297.
 Reprints for first time verses by R. L. S. from the *National observer*, Jan. 17, 1891.
- Moore, John Robert. "Stevenson's source for 'The merry men.'" *PQ*, XXIII, 135-40.
- Swinburne. Memorabilist. "Comments." *N & Q*, March 11, p. 127; Apr. 22, p. 193.
- Tennyson (see also II, Morgan). *A selection from the poems of Tennyson*. Selected and with introd. by W. H. Auden. New York: Doubleday. Pp. xx+268.
 Rev. by L. Kennedy in *Book week*, Nov. 19, p. 14; by G. Mayberry in *New R*, Jan. 1, 1945, p. 24.
- Basler, Roy P. "Tennyson the psychologist." *SAQ*, XLIII, 143-59.
 Analysis of *Maud*.
- Emery, Clark. "The background of Tennyson's 'airy navies.'" *Isis*, XXXV, Part II, 139-47.
- Howarth, R. G. "Tennyson and Ovid." *N & Q*, Jan. 29, p. 69.
 Misquotation by Tennyson.
- M., M. "From Tennyson's library." *More books*, XIX, 71-72.
 Acquisition by the Boston Public Library of four books, once Tennyson's.
- M., T. O. "Tennyson and an autograph fiend." *N & Q*, July 1, p. 15.
- Paden, W. D. "Tennyson and Persian poetry again." *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 652-56. See VB 1942, 349 (Tennyson: Yohannon).
- Paden, W. D. *Tennyson in Egypt*. . . . See VB 1943, 259.
 Rev. by G. Sanders in *MLQ*, V, 379-80.
- Paden, W. D., and Mabbott, T. O. "Tennyson's 'The poet.'" *Ex*, Vol. II, item 56; Vol. III, item 9.
- Ratchford, Fannie E. *An exhibition of manuscripts and printed books at the University of Texas, October 1-30, 1942: Alfred, Lord Tennyson, 1809-1892*. Pp. 20.
 Rev. in *LQ*, XIV, 92.
- Rose, Félix. "Tennyson et Victor Hugo: deux poètes, deux peuples, une époque." *Rev. de la pensée franç.*, III, 12-21.
 Points out numerous parallels in the men and in their works.

- Thackeray** (see also **Disraeli**: Cline; **Kipling**: Green; **Lockhart**: Parker). Moore, John Robert. "Scott and Henry Esmond." *N & Q*, June 17, pp. 288-89.
Similarities to *St. Ronan's Well*.
- Thompson**. Connolly, Terence L. *Francis Thompson: in his paths, a visit to persons and places associated with the poet*. Milwaukee: Bruce. Pp. xii+203.
Rev. by A. Wolfe in *SRL*, Jan. 13, 1945, p. 26.
- Thomson, James** (see **Housman**: Woodbridge).
- Trollope** (see also III, Munson; **Disraeli**: Cline). A., H.; Walker, Benjamin; and "Sayar." "Trollope: *Can you forgive her?*" *N & Q*, Aug. 12, p. 82; Sept. 23, p. 153; Oct. 21, p. 197.
Queries and answers.
- C., R. W. "The text of Trollope's *Sir Harry Hotspur*." *N & Q*, Jan. 1, pp. 2-3.
Suggested emendations.
- Chapman, R. W. "The text of *Phineas Finn*." *TLS*, March 25, p. 156; reply by S. Nowell-Smith, *TLS*, March 25, p. 156; reply by S. Nowell-Smith, *TLS*, Apr. 15, p. 192.
- D., T. C. "Victorian editors and Victorian delicacy." *N & Q*, Dec. 2, pp. 251-53.
Suppressions by Charles Dickens the younger in Trollope's *Is he Popenjoy?* which appeared in *All the year round* (1877-78).
- Edwards, Ralph. "Trollope on church affairs." *TLS*, Oct. 21, p. 516.
- Greenberg, Clement. "A Victorian novel." *ParR*, XI, 234-38.
An analysis of Trollope's *The American senator*, "one of the most interesting novels in English."
- Jones, Frank Pierce. "Anthony Trollope and the classics." *Classical weekly*, XXXVII, 227-31.
- MacCarthy, Desmond. "Trollope on the stage." *NS*, XXVII, 252.
- Menander's mirror. "Imagining the future." *TLS*, Dec. 9, p. 591.
- Trollope, Frances**. Scudder, Harold H. "Mrs. Trollope and slavery in America." *N & Q*, July 29, pp. 46-48.
- Similarity of *Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw* (1836) to *Uncle Tom's cabin*.
- White**. Drummond, A. L. "Blanco White: Spanish priest, refugee, celebrity, English clergyman, Unitarian, and skeptic (1775-1841)." *HJ*, XLII, 263-72.
Interesting article on one of Newman's early Oxford friends.
- Wilde** (see also III, Le Comte: **Dowson**: Longaker). Nethercot, Arthur H. "Oscar Wilde and the devil's advocate." *PMLA*, LIX, 833-50.
Analysis of Wilde's writings as self-revelation.
- Yeats** (see also II, Morgan; **Beddoes**: Gregory). Alspach, R. K. "Yeats's first two published poems." *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 555-57.
- Gill, W. W. "Pollexfen in W. B. Yeats' ancestry." *N & Q*, Dec. 30, pp. 294-95.
- Hone, J. B. *W. B. Yeats*. . . . See VB 1943, 260.
Rev. by J. Bennett in *RES*, XX, 90-91.
- Mabbott, T. O., and Witt, Marion. "Yeats' 'The wild swans at Coole.'" *Ex*, Vol. III, items 5, 17.
- Savage, Derek S. *Personal principle: studies in modern poetry*. London: Routledge. Pp. viii+196.
- Yeats, J. B. *Letters to his son, W. B. Yeats, and others, 1869-1922*. Ed. with a memoir by Joseph Hone, and a preface by Oliver Elton. London: Faber. Pp. 296.
Rev. by E. C. in *Connoisseur*, CXIII, 131-32; by M. Lindsay in *Poetry rev.*, XXXV, 246; by T. Worsley in *NS*, XXVII, 229-30.
- Yonge** (see also **Coleridge**, Mary). Battiscombe, G. *Charlotte Mary Yonge*. . . . See VB 1943, 260.
Rev. by M., N.-S. in *English*, V, 22-23.
- Leavis, Q. D. "Charlotte Yonge and 'Christian discrimination.'" *Scrutiny*, XII, 152-60.
Calls C. Y. "one of the prolific fiction-writers whom time alone has already expelled." Includes rev. of Georgiana Battiscombe's biog. (see above).

BOOK REVIEWS

From art to theatre. By GEORGE R. KERNODLE.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
[1944]. Pp. x+255+62 illus.

Professor Kernodle has attempted a complete reinterpretation of the history of the Renaissance and Baroque stages in the light of traditions and conventions of the visual arts. A literary historian, he owes to the nature of his subject the enviable privilege of presenting to the public the fruit of his labors with all the advantages of form usually at the command of the historian of art.

In view of the amount of new light his study of art has enabled him to shed on the history of stage decoration, one wonders that scholars should have hitherto limited their attention to the reverse influence. The further and equally neglected question of an influence of the pictorial arts on the neoclassical dramatist's theories and practice¹ was no doubt beyond the already large scope of Kernodle's study. He has been able, however, to contribute something to it in presenting the first introduction of the unity of place as a triumph of new Renaissance over old medieval visual-art conventions. Although this side of the question is only one of many, it has certainly been overlooked so far by most historians of the unities.

Kernodle's fundamental assumption is that the variety of the Renaissance stage types cannot be rationally accounted for unless we consider the basic problem that dominates the origins of both painting and stage-designing: that of the organization of space. In the early inorganic narrative picture of the frieze type a rhythm becomes perceptible with the introduction of emblematic elements—tower, canopy

or throne, trees or columns, curtain or flat arcade—on both sides, between or in front of which the personages are grouped; hence these three elemental patterns of composition: center accent, side accent, and back screen. Used singly or in their various combinations, they allow several degrees of control of space, from a temporary pause of the eye in the narrative sequence, to a partial and fragmentary unity within the picture or even to complete unity of the picture as a whole. Those patterns and the symbolic devices with which they had been associated later became part of the artistic tradition. As such, they survived the ancient stage from which they must have been partly derived; and modified, but still clearly recognizable in medieval and early Renaissance art, they became in their turn a source of inspiration for theater decoration.

The value of this distinction of three fundamental patterns is further seen in its connection with another space problem which faces the painter, but not necessarily the stage-designer: that of creating the illusion of the third dimension. In this respect the use of the center accent was naturally limited, while the effect of a succession of receding planes could be obtained by moving the side accents or an open arcade screen to the foreground. These two patterns provided a starting-point and usable elements for later Renaissance experimentation with scientific perspective. They contained the rudimentary forms of the theaters of pictorial illusion; while the center accent and the screen at the back, limited to their emblematic value, were to develop into the theaters of architectural symbolism.

One should remain on one's guard against the seductions of a too coherent and logical system. The fact that almost every type of Renaissance stage can thus be traced up to one of the three patterns undoubtedly provides an enlightening principle of interpretation and a legitimate basis for a working hypothesis; but it does not by itself prove influence either from

¹ Mention should be made here in this connection—and mainly because it is absent from Kernodle's otherwise very complete bibliography of the subject—of Gustave Lanson's "Note sur un passage de Vitruve" (*Revue de la Renaissance*, V [1904], 72-84; and *Etudes d'histoire littéraire* [Paris: Champion, 1929]). On the broader question of the relationship between art and neoclassical literary doctrines, the present reviewer hopes to make known in the not too distant future the results of his own investigations.

or through the artistic tradition. For, had they been ignorant of that tradition, the medieval and early Renaissance designers, starting from the same primitive processional forms, might well have retraced the steps of their ancient predecessors and fallen back into the same fundamental patterns, even perhaps into some of their simpler combinations. However, in the arts more complex and elaborate forms had been evolved out of the basic ones. And the more complex the form, the more significant its persistence on the stage will be. Most revealing of all is the continued use on the stage of architectural motifs and emblematic devices long associated in art with the basic patterns. But the question whether filiation from the arts, once established in the case of one particular stage, can *ipso facto* be assumed in other theaters of the same type depends on how much significance can be seen in the existence of a basic or secondary pattern in a given stage type.

This points to the weak spot in Kernodle's theory of the origin of the Elizabethan stage. Creizenach had noticed its family likeness with the Dutch Rederyker stage. Kernodle demonstrates convincingly the derivation of this stage from the street *tableaux vivants* and the "show architecture" of altar and tomb. But to prove kinship with the Elizabethan theater some common ancestor had to be found. Kernodle considers the complex frontispiece of the show architecture as an elaboration on a combination of center accent and back screen, a secondary pattern essentially that of the Elizabethan stage. Hence the inference: in both cases, the link between art and theater must have been the street *tableaux*, which, of course, has to be substantiated if the whole argument is to stand. To do this, Kernodle draws on the hitherto untapped source of information which his comprehensive study of the *tableaux vivants* has brought to light for the first time. The conventions and emblematic architectural devices of the *tableaux* are here studied in their visual-art origins and are classified. Some are already known to have been used on the Elizabethan stage. Kernodle shows the symbolic significance they must have acquired, from a long familiarity with

works of art and *tableaux vivants*, for playgoers on whose powers of imagination the Elizabethan poet did not perhaps depend as much as was once supposed. As for the devices and conventions not already attested on the Elizabethan stage, Kernodle turns to the internal evidence of the plays. In view of the obvious risks of the method and the hypothetical nature of what has been written on the subject, Kernodle may be said to have made a valuable contribution to that large body of "minor conjectural science," as Renan once defined history.

Thanks to Kernodle, the Mysteries no longer are the only available main source of documents on the medieval stage. His rediscovery of the *tableaux vivants* may well rank with the most important contributions made in recent years to the history of the stage. But it by no means dwarfs the rest of the book.

In the case of the Italian perspective stage, the pictorial origin can be proved almost beyond doubt. But nowhere is it more obvious than in the application then made of the new science of perspective—essentially a painter's technique—to the three-dimensional elements inherited from the medieval stage, in order to organize them into a realistic background picture for the characters. The inconsistencies of that telltale compromise are seen in the problems, unknown or already solved in painting, which confronted the stage-designers. One difficulty, in the case of a foreshortened third-dimensional picture, arose from the existence of only one correct eyepoint. The problem, Kernodle ingeniously says, could be solved only in an aristocracy by making the eyepoint coincide with the duke's box. But did not the trend away from architectural realism toward pictorial illusion—on which Kernodle throws considerable light—lead to that democratic solution which he complains was never reached until our day? What he says about the early tendency in France toward a shallow stage, depending for depth effect mainly on the older system of receding planes and on aerial perspective, suggests that the French designers were perhaps conscious of the difficulty and favored the forms which best avoided it. A closer examination of many of Mahelot's sketches

seems to confirm this impression. And it should be noted that in France the king's box in public theaters does not seem to have been at the eyepoint.

Another of the designers' problems was the "framing of the perspective scene." This is the title of the chapter in which Kernodle discusses at length the origins of the proscenium frame—too exclusively, perhaps, as a perspective problem and in terms of the time and effort it took to "extricate" the formal framing elements from inside the picture, where they had formerly been used to mark the receding planes. His own thesis might have benefited from closer attention to the psychological effect of each different type of framing. The evolution he describes, from architectural realism to pictorial illusion, is largely one from realism with a minimum of deception of the senses to realism with a maximum of delusion of the eyes. Was not the next conceivable step illusion accepted and enjoyed as such? In this respect the type of frame used has suggestive power. As an integral part of a realistic, three-dimensional scene, it could not affect the ideal space relationship between spectator and setting. More versatile is the arch in the auditorium wall: now a realistic archway to some adjoining edifice, now a "charm'd magic casement opening on" some distant "faery land." But the strongest suggestion of unreality is carried by a conventional picture-frame, which serves only as a means to define the ideal interception plane of the picture and has no true architectonic relation with either picture or wall. It marks the term of the evolution, and it occurs on the French neoclassical stage, as could be expected from the Baroque designer's fondness for conceiving his scene as a framed picture. In many cases the very aspect of the scene must have invited, in the spectators themselves, a disposition to view the stage, for a few moments at least, as a decorative picture on the wall.

This willingness to lend one's self to the illusion seems to have coexisted, at the time, with the uncompromising realism which bans what might dispel a complete illusion of reality, e.g., the realism of a D'Aubignac, who admits changes of scene—this must be maintained

against Kernodle²—only if they were possible in reality. But the sudden change of scene which D'Aubignac's contemporaries loved dearly (and for which he himself betrays a weakness) implies a sense of unreality perfectly consistent with pictorial illusion accepted as such. At the same time, unreality of the picture does not exclude realism in the picture. And Kernodle may be quite right when he sees the influence of the new artistic ideals in the growing impatience with the simultaneous setting. But, paradoxically, the patience of the public with that convention—provided there was unity of the *tableau*—may be even more symptomatic: on the French stage, pictorial unity preceded conceptual unity.

It is a healthy sign for a book when the reader feels tempted to look for more evidence and to anticipate the author's thought.

GEORGES F. VÉDIER

University of Wyoming

Christopher Smart: a biographical and critical study. By EDWARD G. AINSWORTH and CHARLES E. NOYES. ("University of Missouri studies," Vol. XVIII, No. 4.) Columbia: University of Missouri, 1943. Pp. 164.

Christopher Smart, for whom a single page was sufficient in Volume X of the *Cambridge history* (in a chapter by Saintsbury entitled "Young, Collins, and lesser poets of the age of Johnson"), appears in the *Cambridge bibliography* among the major poets of the eighteenth century. This increase in reputation between 1913 and 1940 is not due solely to greater appreciation of the *Song to David*, for this incomparable poem had its admirers throughout the nineteenth century and to it Browning devoted one of the best of his *Parleyings*. The rise of Smart's reputation is rather to be at-

² Another debatable point, in the same chapter, is whether La Mesnardière ever "recommended" anything beyond greater clarity in the use of the accepted simultaneous setting of his day. Two minor errors have found their way into Kernodle's discussion of the French stage. "It was Rigal who discovered," Professor Lancaster himself writes, "... that the medieval stage decoration was still in use in the seventeenth century" (see p. 3). And the stage of Fontenay-le-Comte was not a theater in Paris (see p. 207). On the same page "Moiret" is an obvious misprint for "Mairet."

tributed to a more sympathetic approach to the age in which he lived and to an increase in information about his life and works. The most important contribution in recent years was the discovery by W. Force Stead of a poem written by Smart during his years of confinement in the madhouse and published with elaborate annotations by Stead in 1939 under the title, *Rejoice in the Lamb*.

Full-length studies of Smart, however, are rare. Professor Ainsworth at the time of his death in 1940 had in preparation such a study, and the present volume represents his work completed and revised by Mr. Noyes. It brings together in convenient compass all that is known with certainty of Smart's unfortunate career and works into the thread of the narrative a critical survey of Smart's poetry. It leans heavily, perforce, upon the biographical sketch which the poet's nephew, Christopher Hunt, prefixed to the edition of Smart's poems published at Reading in 1791, but it makes use also of the notes contributed by Gosse to the *Athenaeum* in 1887, as well as more recent and independent investigation. Much of Smart's biography remains conjectural—on such matters as the exact time of his coming to London from Cambridge ("sometime after the spring of 1749"); the date of his marriage with John Newbery's stepdaughter; his relations with Fielding; and the rumor (circulated by Mason) that Smart was "persecuting the people who confined him." Smart's Grub-street career is not easy to follow, but Ainsworth and Noyes have provided the student with excellent clues, and their book will be useful, though the absence of an index will be annoying to everyone who wishes to consult it. Their account of Smart's Cambridge career, his quarrels with Kenrick and Hill, and the composition of the Seatonian Prize Poems may be pointed out as especially good. They print for the first time the poem "To Lyce" (p. 24) and claim for Smart the authorship of the "Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer" in the *Gentleman's magazine* for September, 1754.

The chief argument for attributing the "Paraphrase" to Smart is, clearly, that it resembles the *Song to David*, and it is equally clear that for Ainsworth and Noyes the *Song*

to David is the poetic touchstone by which Smart is to be judged. It is the one poem which lifts him above "the reasonable eighteenth century" (p. 108), "an age whose poetry glittered, but rarely glowed" (p. 163). For Smart's other work their praise is faint indeed: the fables are "pleasant enough trivia," and the occasional poems are "enjoyable enough in their way" (p. 55), etc. But his "enthusiastic fondness for the flowers and birds of the countryside" is "a quality almost unique in the poets of his day" (p. 10). This, I think, is the reason for Noyes's repeated approval (pp. 34, 56-57, 111-12, 114-15) of the unfortunate suggestion that "The Benedicite paraphrased" of James Merrick is a hitherto unknown poem of Smart's.¹ It should be recognized by now that Smart lives not only by the poem which anticipates Blake and Wordsworth but also by the equally brilliant verse of another kind which is contemporary with Shenstone and Byrom and Christopher Anstey. It seems unlikely that many poems in the style of *Rejoice in the Lamb* or the *Song to David* will be identified in the future as the work of Smart; but there is every reason to suppose that further investigation will add to the Smart canon a number of occasional or burlesque poems, good in their kind. An example may be seen in the "New ballad," which R. B. Botting has recently reprinted from the *Gray's Inn journal* and which is almost certainly Smart's. A study of the periodicals of the 1750's would be a profitable task from this point of view.² *The Midwife, or the old woman's magazine*, which Smart edited for Newbery (1751-53), contains a great many poems admittedly by Smart and probably many which have not yet been identified. Certainly it deserves more scrutiny than has been given it by Ainsworth and Noyes.

Useful as the present volume is, it has prob-

¹ See Robert E. Brittain, "An early model for Smart's *A song to David*," *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 165-74; and the articles by Philip R. Wikelund in *ELH*, IX (1942), 136-40, and Alan D. McKillop in *PMLA*, LVIII (1943), 582.

² Botting's article just cited ("Christopher Smart's association with Arthur Murphy," *JEGP*, XLIII [1944], 49-56) provides a good illustration of what may be done. Hawkesworth's *Adventurer*, No. 100, October 20, 1753, seems to contain an allusion to Smart which has not, I think, been noted.

ably appeared too early. New facts about Smart's life are continuing to appear, as well as new identifications of his work; and not until this process has gone further will it be possible to write a biography or critical study even approaching definitiveness.³

DONALD F. BOND

University of Chicago

The German Catholic estimate of Goethe (1790-1939): a contribution to the study of the relation of German Catholicism to secular culture. By WILLIAM J. MULLOY. ("University of California publications in modern philology," Vol. XXIV, No. 4.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1944. Pp. vii+357-457.

This careful and well-documented study of an important subject will prove of substantial use for the interpretation of Goethe, as well as to research both in the survival of Goethe's personality and philosophy and also in the intellectual history of German Catholicism.

Excluding aesthetic criticism from his consideration, the author traces the Catholic "judgment" of Goethe and its consequences in the interpretation of Goethe's works. It is in correspondence with the changing attitude of Catholicism toward secular culture in the last one hundred and fifty years that Mulloy distinguishes three periods of Catholic Goethe-interpretation—an era of "naïve" appreciation, an age of intransigence, and a turn toward an affirmative approach to Goethe. The author recognizes, however, that thereby the prevailing trends only are characterized while the controversy among Catholics on the subject continued, although decreasingly, through the third period. Each of these chapters deals separately with the interpretation of Faust and in this respect presents a supplement to studies such as that of Ada Klett.¹

³ Misprints are comparatively few. The poet Langhorne's name is amusingly misprinted on p. 53. On p. 66, l. 7, read: the boldest borrower we shall meet with among men of real genius; p. 68, l. 9: for would read will; ll. 15-16, read: The real return that he has made me is in an abusive poem . . . ; p. 71, ll. 7-8, read: they deserve to be expelled the republic of letters.

¹ Ada Martha Klett, *Der Streit um Faust II seit 1900* (Jena, 1939).

The first era of Catholic Goethe-interpretation is called "naïve" in so far as its judgment, on the whole, was literary and humane rather than dictated by the crusading spirit of a church in self-defense. Mulloy makes it amply evident that the twentieth-century critics with more subtle methods returned to Eichendorff's and Daumer's understanding of Goethe. When Eichendorff's and Daumer's views were established, the ideological hardening of positions, which is basic to the attitude of the "age of intransigence," had not yet become general. Against the background of the disintegrating relationship between Catholicism and secular culture in the era of the *Kulturkampf*, the second chapter then shows the alienation of the Catholic critics from Goethe and his work. Adhering closely to the investigation of Friedrich Fuchs, Mulloy emphasizes the conflict between philosophical radicalism and Christianity in the nineteenth century as the essential cause of this alienation. Consequently, the leading work of the period, Baumgartner's *Goethe*, appears as partisan history written in a reaction against the effort to capitalize on Goethe's "Bildung" in order to substitute it for Christian religion. The "New Faith" of David Friedrich Strauss, for instance, was an outright challenge. The reply it called forth, while aiming at those who had claimed the poet for the anti-Christian cause, instead struck Goethe himself. Catholicism was on the defensive and inclined to seclude itself from even potential heresy. This is illustrated by Mulloy's study with the same clarity as are the consequences of fanatical partisan history, which affect literary and philosophical understanding in general.

In the third period, by contrast with such intransigence and suspicion, the desire prevailed among Catholics to leave the ivory tower of intellectual isolationism. It is a particular merit of Mulloy's study that it pays due attention to the movement in favor of the "Wiederbegegnung von Kirche und Kultur in Deutschland," which, for decades, had an influential focus in Karl Muth and his periodical, *Das Hochland*. The author might have added that the liberation, in matters of literary judgment, from an almost sectarian exclusiveness

was prepared in another field of secular culture by the open-minded view of the social problem which Bishop von Ketteler established (cf. p. 378). Expeditus Schmidt, Friedrich Muckermann, Benedikt Momme Nissen, the friend and fellow-convert of Langbehn, are among those who contributed to the increasingly affirmative attitude of Catholics by asking for the significance of Goethe's philosophical views in the light of the Christian faith rather than for the differences between his philosophy and the dogma. By no means did they dim the line of demarcation between the supernatural revelation, basic to the teachings of the Church, and the natural religion of Goethe. But they recognized the importance of reverence and striving, of guilt and redemption in Goethe's moral philosophy, and they were inclined to consider him, like Vergil, possessed of an "anima naturaliter Christiana."

The character of the book as a critical report prevents the author from further exploring many problems which he inevitably came to touch upon. So the Catholic judgment about the antagonism between the strongly dualistic Protestant orthodoxy and the "monism" of the German classical humanists (pp. 357 and 451) implies the contention that their humanism is, in fact, nearer to the Catholic approach toward secular culture than to that of the Lutherans, who rigidly insist that culture is part of the realm of sin. In the light of Karl Barth's "antihumanism," which corresponds to Reinhold Niebuhr's opposition of "Reformation" against "Renaissance," the recent German Catholic approach to Goethe—as well as to other non-Catholic literary figures—gains particular significance indeed. It is correct when Mulloy conclusively states that Catholics, while they cannot "regard Goethe as a final authority on the conduct of life, . . . can and do claim him in many respects as their spiritual ally" (p. 452). If spiritual existence as such is in danger, as was and still is the case in Germany, such an alliance between Goethean humanism and Christianity is called for more vitally than ever before. Opening up such vistas, Mulloy's study may be helpful not only to the student of history but also to those who want to investigate the intellectual conditions

under which both German Catholicism and the tradition of Goethean humanism entered the contemporary crisis.

ARNOLD BERGSTRAESSER

University of Chicago

The letters of Mary W. Shelley. Collected and edited by FREDERICK L. JONES. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944. 2 vols. Pp. xxxii+379; xx+390.

These handsome volumes contain probably the most extensive collection of letters that has ever been made for anyone of no greater personal importance than Mary Shelley. Every scrap of her correspondence which a most diligent editor has been permitted to use is here, including mere postscripts by Mary to letters by others, chiefly Shelley; fragments from sales catalogues and other printed sources; summaries of letters whose owners were not co-operative, etc. There is also a surprisingly long list (II, 343-46) of letters Jones was unable to trace, and he gives numbers in his chronological sequence to twenty-odd epistles to T. J. Hogg which he could not publish.

Approximately half of the correspondence is here printed for the first time; but so thorough has Shelley scholarship been that nothing of importance is added antedating the poet's death and very little from the first few years thereafter. The letters previously printed, however, are scattered in more than twenty different publications (listed in I, xxv-xxvii), several of which are not easy of access. Of the most important of these, for example, *Shelley and Mary* (1882), only twelve copies were printed. In others, such as Dowden's *Life of Shelley* (1886) and Mrs. Marshall's *Life and letters of Mary W. Shelley* (1889), the old selective method of printing letters was followed, with omission of what the author or editor considered trivial or in any way undesirable, and considerable editing in matters of sentence structure, punctuation, etc. It is therefore a great service to have, now assembled in order, complete texts, mostly based on manuscripts, of letters heretofore so widely scattered and often fragmentary or inaccurate.

Among the new letters there are several to

Leigh Hunt or his wife, of which the most interesting deal with Mary's return to England in 1823. In 1825 the first of several candidates for the attractive young widow's hand comes to notice. He was John Howard Payne, now remembered almost solely as author of "Home, sweet home," but then a moderately successful playwright. A majority of Mary's letters to him appeared in a publication of the Bibliophile Society of Boston entitled *The Romance of Mary W. Shelley, John Howard Payne, and Washington Irving* (1907); but Jones makes additions and discusses this book in an appendix (II, 347-53).

A few letters to Sir John Bowring have enabled Jones to identify as by Mrs. Shelley some articles in the *Westminster review* (I, 376; II, 11, 19), of which Bowring was then editor. Several to Charles Ollier reveal negotiations with the publisher Colburn for some of Mary's later novels. Others to Edward Moxon tell something of the progress of her important collection of Shelley's works in 1839 and later. There are two letters of 1839 to Peacock's daughter Mary, who was fated to become George Meredith's estranged wife of *Modern love*. Other new letters make additions to the story of George Byron, who claimed to be a son of Lord Byron and the "Maid of Athens" and to own many letters by Byron, Shelley, and others, which, however, were found to be mostly forgeries.

From 1828 to the end, most of the letters are published here for the first time. About sixty are to Sir Timothy Shelley's solicitors, mainly brief and often trivial, except as they show what a struggle Mary had to secure from a hostilely prejudiced father-in-law even decent financial support for his heir to the baronetcy. The great bulk of the new material consists of about a hundred letters to Claire Clairmont, mostly in the Huntington Library and dated from 1842 to 1849. Though Jones emphasizes their importance, they are long, carelessly written, full of details largely about people of little interest or importance; and such grains as they contain are almost buried in chaff. It is true, however, that they make revelations little known to Mary's biographers of her relations with an Italian political exile named Gat-

teschi, who turned out to be a blackmailer and from whom she had difficulty in recovering overardent letters she had written (II, 193-94). There is also in these letters to Claire a good deal about the adjustment of the estate after Sir Timothy finally gave up the ghost at the age of ninety-one.

A word should be said as to the letters to Hogg, which I have mentioned as listed but not printed. A footnote (I, 7) indicates that Jones read at least some of them. That White also saw them is evident from his discussion of "Experiment in free love" (Newman I. White, *Shelley*, I, 391-93). A review in the *Times literary supplement* for October 28, 1944, of *Harriet and Mary*, edited by Walter Sidney Scott, suggests that these letters to Hogg may now be in print, for part of one is quoted in the review. As White's discussion and Jones's note show, the letters early in 1815 reveal a shocking willingness of Mary, of whom it is charitable to remember that she was only seventeen and her lover's slave, to conform with Shelley's strange willingness to share her with his friend.

The editor's work seems to have been extremely careful and accurate. I suspect an error—for which, however, Sir John Shelley-Rolls or his copyist must be responsible—in "Lauberflaut" (I, 275); *Zauberflöte* (Mozart's opera) is apparently meant. "Space" (II, 205, l. 10) looks like an error for "spare." A few additional footnotes of explanation might have been given. For example, "no significant hand" (I, 21) might puzzle a reader unfamiliar with Hunt's practice of signing his own articles in the *Examiner* with an outstretched hand. There is no identification of two recipients of late letters—Mr. Blewitt (II, 310, 311) and Mr. Touchet (II, 328, 337, 339)—nor does either name appear in the index. I notice a few errata, such as "Williamston, Mass." (I, 353) and "Keat's" (II, 344). The Quaker poet Wifien's middle initial was *H*, not *F* (II, 124).

In each volume there is a facsimile of a letter, besides several portraits and other illustrations—mostly familiar except the attractive but girlish-looking pencil sketch of Shelley by Mary (II, opp. 12).

GEORGE L. MARSH

University of Chicago

Hazlitt in the workshop. By STEWART C. WILCOX. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xiv + 94.

The reason for the perhaps too pretentious title of this study lies in the fact that it provides an opportunity to examine changes made in the process of preparing for publication one of Hazlitt's most famous essays on a subject unique in his works. Hazlitt manuscripts are so scarce that this is an unusual privilege. The book consists of a transcription, "with collation, notes, and commentary," of the Morgan Library manuscript in the author's hand of "The fight," which he contributed over the signature "Phantastes" to the *New monthly magazine* for February, 1822. The manuscript is not complete: it begins with page 9 and lacks presumably the last page and seven intervening pages. (The list of missing leaves in n. 7 on p. 9, by the way, fails to include 24, which should have been mentioned.) The text of the essay as printed is provided where missing pages

should have appeared, and careful notes record differences between the manuscript and the printed text. Leaf 41 of the manuscript, showing the beginning of a long canceled passage, is reproduced as a frontispiece.

The chief point of interest is that the manuscript shows several canceled digressive passages, all alluding to Hazlitt's strange passion for the heroine of *Liber amoris*, which was at its height when he wrote this essay. Footnotes indicate how these canceled passages were later used in *Liber amoris* and other writings, showing the author's thrift in not allowing what he considered bits of good writing to go to waste.

In Part VI of his study Wilcox quotes various comments by contemporaries on Hazlitt's methods of work and attempts to demonstrate how interlineations in the manuscript "show his flair for choosing the right word."

GEORGE L. MARSH

University of Chicago

cord
the
now-
age,

anu-
pas-
sion
as at
notes
were
ings,
iving
o go

vari-
itt's
rate
how

ASH



405
MO

English

VOLUME XLII

NUMBER 4

May 1945

MODERN PHILOLOGY

*A Journal devoted to research in
Medieval and Modern Literature*

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

RONALD S. CRANE, *Managing Editor*

GERALD EADES BENTLEY
TOM PRINTE CROSS

JAMES R. HULBERT
WILLIAM A. NITEN
GEORGE T. NORTUP

ROBERT VIGNERON
GEORGE WILLIAMSON

ADVISORY BOARD

WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE
JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

GEORGE W. SHELBURN
ARCHER TAYLOR

ERNEST H. WILKINS
FRANCIS A. WOOD

VOL. XLII

CONTENTS FOR MAY 1945

No. 4

The <i>Lay of the Big Fool</i> : Its Irish and Arthurian Sources	Sheila Joyce McHugh	197
Marcel Proust ou l'Anglaise créatrice	Robert Vigneron	212
Victorian Bibliography for 1944	William D. Templeman	231
Book Reviews		249

GEORGE R. KERNODLE: *From art to theatre* (Georges F. Védier).—EDWARD G. AINSWORTH and CHARLES E. NOTES: *Christopher Smart: a biographical and critical study* (Donald F. Bond).—WILLIAM J. MULLOY: *The German Catholic estimate of Goethe (1780-1858): a contribution to the study of the relation of German Catholicism to secular culture* (Arnold Bergtrauer).—FREDERICK L. JONES (ed.): *The letters of Mary W. Shelley* (George L. Marsh).—STEWART C. WILCOX: *Haeftit in the workshop* (George L. Marsh).

Modern Philology is published quarterly by the University of Chicago at the University Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Ill. The subscription price is \$5.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.40), on single copies 10 cents (total \$1.35). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to The Managing Editor of MODERN PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 13, 1903, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917. Section 1103 amended February 28, 1925, authorized on July 14, 1918.

[PRINTED
IN U.S.A.]

SHAKESPEARE & JONSON

THEIR REPUTATIONS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY COMPARED

By

GERALD EADES BENTLEY

In this two-volume work Mr. Bentley presents proof that during the entire century in which they lived, wrote, and died Ben Jonson's reputation was far superior to Shakespeare's. It shows that Jonson was considered by his contemporaries the greater dramatist and was far more widely honored in his lifetime and eulogized after his death than was the man whom modern critics acclaim as the greatest master of English letters.

VOLUME ONE paints a clear, detailed picture of the reputations of both writers in each decade of the seventeenth century in a readable, as well as erudite, discussion. The author sets up a standard of validity for, and examines chronologically and according to the kinds of statements they contain, the more than 5,000 known allusions to Shakespeare and Jonson. All students of English literature should find this volume as interesting as it is valuable.

VOLUME TWO contains the tools of the scholar, listing more than 1,100 allusions to Shakespeare and Jonson which Mr. Bentley has discovered in seventeenth-century documents. Of these previously unpublished allusions, the addition of 1,079 to the Jonson list is of particular importance as it more than doubles the number of known references to the writer who far outshone Shakespeare in the eyes of his contemporaries.

Volume I, Discussion volume, \$2.50

Volume II, Allusions volume, \$6.00

Set of two volumes, \$7.50



UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

ANNOUNCEMENT TO READERS

The issue of *Modern Philology* for August, 1945, will be devoted to a series of studies on Celtic and Medieval subjects in honor of

TOM PEETE CROSS

Advance orders for this number should be sent to The University of Chicago Press.

Price, \$1.25

*Most comprehensive anthology
of Mexican prose and poetry*

ANTOLOGIA DE LA LITERATURA MEXICANA

Introducción, Selecciones y Crítica de

CARLOS CASTILLO

A Literary Panorama—this anthology contains representative samples of the prose and poetry of Mexico from the Despatches of Cortes to the writings of the present century. In it are pages written by conquerors and missionaries, *criollos* of the colonial period, as well as authors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

All in Spanish—this anthology is presented entirely in Spanish so that it may serve Spanish-Americans as well as Anglo-Americans.

Complete Units—each selection from the works of the forty-one authors represented is a coherent whole. A complete story, a whole poem, an entire legend make for more satisfying reading and a juster evaluation of the author's work.

Biography and Bibliography—each selection is preceded by a brief biographical and critical note on the author. An introduction tracing the history and evolution of Mexican literature will be particularly useful to the student. A bibliography of Mexican literature increases still further the value of the book.

\$3.50

The University of Chicago Press

